00111513

PREFACE.

SINCE there is such a variety of professed "Faiths" in the Religious world, and yet it behoves "every one to be fully persuaded in his own mind," the Writer has been forced *as a Layman* to think for himself about subjects which he has been taught to reverence from his childhood. He has busied himself most particularly with the *New* Testament; first of all in the Original, as we have it, before he resorted to 'Commentaries,' &c.; but last of all with more and more zest with the Original. In this study, Concordances, more especially, and Grammars, &c., have been, almost more than even Lexicons, his first and last resort. He here tries to present some of the results reached, and also somewhat of his method of research (which has been pretty much like the Anatomists and the Chemists in their respective fields), both of which may prove suggestive, even by their very failures and puerilities.

As it was very probable that these would be numerous, it may be asked why such *Lay* efforts were published? I do not much care to particularly answer this question. To my own mind it seems a suitable reply, first, that few but Laymen seem to estimate, or to relish, the difficulties of Laymen

Digitized with financial assistance from the Government of Maharashtra on 18 July, 2018

among such subjects; and secondly, that few, if any, besides Laymen, seem quite free from bias, or from reserve, or from restraint of some kind or other, to permit them fully, freely, frankly to exhibit such investigations. The deep topics which so engage and concern us seem to be either *sealed* subjects, or else of quite secondary moment, in comparison with 'Church *History*,' and 'Church Dogmas.' At last even these, too, are now questioned. I, for one, think very properly so. How, indeed, could it much longer be otherwise in these days, in this country? "Speaking with ἐξουσία, and not as do the Scribes," means "with *the authority*" *and freedom* of intelligent personal experience and acquaintance, among *intelligent* persons in these days, and and not by rule and rote as in days by-gone.

An anecdote will serve to show my meaning, even *within* 'the Church.' Not long ago I was relating, with much pleasure, the custom of a much older Clergyman than my companion, in 'the administration of the Sacrament,' when first taking 'the Elements' himself, of not only saying *aloud* the proper formulæ, but of shaping them into a prayer, thus, "*May* the body —— *I* take —— and *desire to* feed" —— "*May* the blood —— *I* drink —— *the Lord make me* thankful." I admired this modesty in a Septuagenarian; but was really 'shut up' by the reply in rebuke of us both — 'Why did he not *pronounce* the words as they stand!' — said with an asperity which was not winning.

00111513

I think we have here a fairish profile of 'high and low' at the present day. *Which* will prove most effectual for good, *Time*, perhaps, will be inadequate to show.

I have aimed to raise some clues towards an unravelment of intricacies and perplexities by reporting impressions gathered from peeps into early Principles; to present old thoughts anew, as well as some new ones, for those to sift who are more competent than I. Much of rubbish, perhaps, and many cobwebs may hang about what I have deemed stepping-stones to, or justifications for, positions. These, it may be trusted, real Masters will kindly step over or brush away; then, with what severity they please, try the worth of any suggestions which arise, of which, indeed, the reach and bearing may be rather considerable. I bespeak their patience, which I fear may be tried not a little, through my mal-adroitness at book-making; for even the very pretence at *sections* was an after-thought for convenience.

It is necessary to state that the quotations of the N. T. are taken for the most part by preference from the *Sinaitic Codex*, as given by Scrivener, with which both Lachmann's and Tischendorf's texts very generally agree. I have not hesitated to translate after my own fashion, because the 'Authorised Version' is in every body's hand, and references to chapter and verse are everywhere given. The differences of translation, too, will excite thought about points less satisfactorily settled than they are assumed to be.

There are several Sections dealing, after the manner of Dis-

sectors, with philological fancies which probably few will like to wade through and be nauseated with. Let them be turned over at once, and other parts taken up. They are indulged partly from a fancy of there being a nearer kinship (by ear, if not by eye) through our own Mother-Tongue, between the Hebrew and the Greek, of 'the Scriptures' at least, if not generally, than is usually allowed; although duly remembering at the same time the seductiveness of Etymology. Yet I cannot concur with those who, with amazing coolness, do deliberately substitute one letter for another in the Hebrew Text by reason of similarity of sound. The consequences of such license, as exhibited in a recent revival and amplification of an earlier work of the same character, seem as defamatory and unjust as they are offensive. We have as good reason to believe that we have in our hands, in the main, the very Text which the writers of the New Testament referred to and used, as for any other fact in history; and we see that they so used and referred to them with religious veneration. I say too, we *see* this, because we believe again that we have in our hands, in the main, *their* Writings also, which certainly do not offend genuine and natural modesty.

Then, these later Writers being what we believe they were, *extra-ordinarily* endowed men, and their Writings having survived a Scrutiny such as none but *Nature's own* works can stand, the query should have proportionate weight whether, passing by our Translation, we *ought not* to be

content with the said Writers' Interpretation of that ancient Hebrew Book? Although, indeed, I am prepared to contend for the reversal of such procedure with respect to *their* Writings in the absence of any *such*, and *so authoritative*, interpretation of *them*, as theirs afford us of the Hebrew.

The subject of 'Human Nature' is treated of with considerable assumption. Since this view was taken I have found it fortified by a portion of a prayer in the Roman Missal. At the mixing of 'the wine and water in the Chalice' the Priest says, '*Deus, qui humanæ substantiæ dignitatem mirabiliter condidisti, et mirabilius reformâsti,*' &c.; which is there thus translated, '*O God, who in creating Human Nature hast wonderfully dignified it, and still more wonderfully reformed it,*' &c. This will be thought '*too loud*' by many; the query suggested is whether Protestantism has, or has not, been *too disparaging?*

The subjects of 'Early Church,' and the Grounds of its Imperious Authority, are but little more than alluded to; yet so as to render them conspicuous in the two earliest particulars treated of. One of these subjects, *the earliest link* indeed of the long historic chain, it is surprising to find treated of, in Burton's 'Ecclesiastical History,' with such facility as if all had been done *en regle*, though the step taken was then quite unprecedented. Whereas Biscoe, full as is his work on "The Acts," does, as does N. T. itself, simply name, and that quite late in his Book, the historic fact without one word of comment! This is unsatisfactory.

That admirable book, Maitland on 'the Dark Ages,' so called, is limited in its scope mainly to the period between 'the eighth and twelfth centuries'; but were it not so, even that able Writer, too, would probably be quite content to start 'Church History' from "the day of Pentecost." Be it so, as for History from that date; yet there is something a-wanting to *ground* its paramount claims to *Authority*. Besides, *early* history, as actually extant, scarcely appears brilliant as it is sifted in 'Ancient Christianity'—a Book of 'Tracts' written about the same time as the former work and other famous 'Tracts,' by a very competent man, though a Layman.

The topic, however, is not an agreeable one; and it may for the present be left for consideration and redress to those who, politically, are proximately concerned in its issues, and can conscientiously *dare* to examine the foundations. The time is fast approaching when it *will* be done, come what may; and present resistance or suppression will but aggravate the commotion at the really great *denouement* when it catches *the public eye of 'The Soul.'*

I will take the liberty to strap on behind an extra bit of *luggage*.

While these pages are in the Press I have read most of the first Number of the New Series of the 'Philological Journal'; yet still venture to launch forth my own already printed matter.

I would with great respect hope to catch the eye of the

Scholarly contributors to it, and may "provoke them to jealousy," *if I am* here, in this following particular, offering a *new* as well as (as seems to me) a *profound* and a *valuable* thought; especially so in its apparent bearing on 'Biblical Truth.' I put it in few words that I may not disgust them with too trifling ideas.

It seems very plain that the old Philosophers had worked out much which 'common sense' instinctively detects of *contrast between 'right and wrong'*; but I am not aware of any recognition of *a probable difference between that formula and 'right and left.'*

I am not able to express my thoughts as I connect this idea with St. Paul's *Religious Philosophy* as he unravels the ancient and so-called Mosaic writings; but it glimmers on my mind that it can afford a "Key" to the lock of a great "*Garner*." The only approach to such a thought which I, who am not schooled, have met with, is at 2 Cor. vi. 7 — "*by the weapons of the 'righteousness' of the rights and of the lefts*," &c.

I scarcely like to "daub *my* untempered mortar" upon this "*pillar*," as I think it may prove, "of the Truth," or, may be, ἑδραίωμα, SEAT, or *settledment*. I therefore content myself with referring to the ὁμολογουμένως *great secret of the* εὐσεβεία," or "*godliness*," in the great passage which is collated with others at the head of my last (19) Section, — 1 Tim. iii. 15, 16, and the *illustration* of it which the Apostle there summarizes from the Old Bible. The chain,

which yet may be no chain, of thoughts which runs through my mind reaches from Gen. i., ii., iii., in their respectively collateral allusions, to impinge on 2 Cor. v. 21, and Heb. x. 5–10, as typically exhibitive of this εὐσεβεία, or "*godliness*," as to 'ways and means.' And the etymology of ἀριστέρος, *a very 'præter-plu-perfect,'* as a *compar.* of ἄριστος, itself already a *superl.* of ἄρ-ης, after the manner of ἕτερος from εἴς, or ὑπέρτερος, from ὑπ-, seems to have a profound reach towards ἁμαρτία, חטא, and χθο-ν; Phil. ii. 5–11.

CONTENTS.

		PAGE
Section	1. "Baptism" — Enquiry	1
,,	2. Rough Outlines of Thought thereon	22
,,	3. Etymology of *μετανοία*	32
,,	4. Linguistic Enquiry	54
,,	5. Interpretation of *μετανοια*	63
,,	6. On "Sin"	73
,,	7 An Attempt at Philological *Dissection*	98
	No. 1, *a*, of the Hebrew Synonyme	99
	No. 2, *b*, of the Greek	109
,,	8. Rough Summary	125
,,	9. 'Repentance'	160
	Discursion 1: On *Heb.* xii. 17 — ἴς	164
	Discursion 2. On '*Know*'	167
	Application	170
,,	10. On 'Candour'	173
,,	11. On '*Art. IX*' and *natus*	181
,,	12. Application of this	192
,,	13. John i. 12, 13	195
,,	14. '*Wonder*'	202
,,	15. Connexion of end of St. Luke's Gospel with "Book of the Acts"	228
,,	16. Acts ii. *in part*	239
,,	17. 1 Cor. xv., *in part*, and chap. x., *in part*	243
,,	18. "*Faith*," *and Belief*	259
,,	19. Final; [Mark iv. 10, 11; Acts xxii. 16; 1 Tim. iii. 15, 16; Heb. x. 19—26; Phil. ii. 5—11]: Acts xx. 20, 21	274
Postscript		279

ERRATUM.

Page 202 — fourth line from top — *for* "facile," *read* "facilis."

"*Baptism.*"

RITUALISM as lately was, and perhaps still is, contended for in the '*Office of Baptism,*' is the topic here considered. The Laity has deemed this matter settled in the case of 'the Gorham controversy,' and views all other ritualistic pretensions in the same light. This decision, however, though yielded to outwardly at the behest of the Law of *the Land which designates 'the Church,'* is disputed, in respect of the other 'Sacrament,' still openly, and the authority of the very Court itself denied. By whom? By the very officials of that church who are principally interested in, and prejudiced for, such a negation. It is not easy in these days again to subject the matter to the final appeal of *force,* to the arbitrament of war; and so, from Rome downwards, the right and propriety of such assumption is again obtrusively arrogated, in defiance of the aforesaid Legal decision. Upon what can it rest but upon the superstition of men through their ignorance or indifference? Thus it seems to me that the question, as a question, resolves itself into the debasement on the one hand, and the effrontery on the other, of Human Nature. Both of these appear to be as offensive, because derogatory, to that human nature's Creator and Recoverer, as it is to the School which should have educated Scholars in that Nature to such unworthy issue. "*Quit you like men,*" is the great advice given by our Great Apostle: whereas his professed 'Successors' would ever keep us in 'leading strings.'

The greatest and most proximate Bible instance of such *Legitimate* assumption as this is '*John the Baptist.*' It seems quite allowable to bring this matter to the test of his teaching, as being, perhaps, beyond dispute. But, as will appear abundantly in our progress, to arrive at a correct view we must follow the lead by St. Luke's and St. Paul's writings, who alone, for many years, appear to have obtained the enfranchisement of true gospel liberty.

Luke iii. 3, is the main text proposed for consideration.

This chapter opens with the particular mention of many important Political conditions, of high significance doubtless when St. Luke wrote, and valuable to us as multiplication of evidence. Chap. i. 80, tells us that the singular man, John Zacharias (as we should now perhaps call him), lived "in the deserts;" in this respect, therefore, as well as in others, thought an eccentric, outlandish man. But in a particular year, and under those political conditions of the time, "there came to be ῥῆμα θεοῦ upon *him* in the desert;" and "he came, or *went*, into, or *unto*, all the neighbourhood of the Jordan, shouting like a herald,"—the text we will examine. By "word of God," here, which "came to be upon him," ῥῆμα, *matter, thing*, we must not mix up the sense of λογος, "word," &c., whatever else we may make of it; for it is a *has been*, rather the *concrete result of a has been*, which came as it were to a focus "upon him."

But probably Luke, by so extensively stating the political conditions of the time, meant to give a clue to the *general* vague expectancy of the peoples, and as if not limited to the Jews; for about the Jordan there must have been all sorts of people who, if the Jews only were really *expectant*, would, in their turn, wonder at the Jews. For that the Jews did not knowingly, or with conscious reservation, do

things by halves, we may by quite sure from Rom. x. 1, 2; so that these foreigners could not suspect the Jews of insincerity nor of craft. This must have *told* in its way upon the foreign mind. So that in one way or another the popular mind was wide awake and on the alert.

One may imagine the state of things by the aid of St. Luke's quotation. In the dead of the night, in our camp, we hear the distant growl of a lion prowling for his prey around us; for John's first exposition about "the forthcoming wrath" is terrific. But not *terror* was the general feeling; for he says on the same occasion, "who *in an underhand way shewed* to you to flee from" it? "who *sub-indicated* to you" so to do? or the Greek may be rendered, "*Did any one sub-indicate* to you?" As if, though the focus indeed was "upon John," the diffused rays were throughout or over the mass of the peoples, probably.

St. Luke quotes the passage from Isaiah with ὡς, not καθως γεγρ, "as has been written," not *according as* "it has been written." (Comp, however, John i. 23, though with ἔφη.)

The Prophet's words — "a voice of one lowing in the deserts, 'Have prepared ye,'" &c., comes in the tone of *persuasion;* precious little of this is there in the language or the behaviour of an Eastern *Herald.* So that the comparison holds good chiefly with respect to circumstantials; it was much more in keeping with the custom of place and time that John's greeting was "O offsprungs of vipers!" The other Gospels make this feature much less conspicuous; but whatever the issue may be, it behoves us Gentiles, if we would be free from undue bias, to take St. Luke's report, as being that which probably informed the great Gentile Apostle about Historical facts, and the

impressions which these facts produced on the general, and not only Jewish, mind.

This *focal* "word, or *matter*, or *thing* of God upon him," John, was no mere *palaver*, "no blarney of reason or of wisdom," after man's fashion, affected no authority derived from the Sanhedrim; nor did he mean it to suffer by the refraction in its transit through him to them. When it impinged upon them, it became through him, *the growl of the Law.* Then we read it in ver. 7–9: ἔλεγεν, "*he leged,*" he *lawed* it to them, "he *lig'd it down as the law,*" to the masses; and the same (by Cod. Sinaitic.) in the two separate cases. But in the third case we read εἶπε, "he *said,*" *q. d., made the proposition*; and this case is that of *officials*, στρατευόμενοι, that is, *on duty*, not merely στρατιῶται, *off duty*; a distinction which quite interprets the passage. So, ever, we are ready to recognise gravity of demeanour on the post of duty far above the mere 'Uniform,' which is but forensic; to respect honest sincerity in the discharge of that duty.

Leaving *propositions*, then, of this sort for those to whom proposals, like "tributes, are due," time, place, circumstance, all in congruity, with a deference which it is most congenial to man to accord; we at present restrict ourselves to the one great feature of the case which I desire to make conspicuous — the *law* of the case, which will apply even to officials *off duty*, as parts of the commonalty, however little disposed such may be to shake down among the *profanum vulgus*. For this seems to me to be amazingly slurred over, or confused. And notwithstanding that harshness of expression may hit the hardest those who are most prominent, I venture to insist on it that to be *deferential* to his superiors is most congenial to man.

The loud "voice of a lowing one in the deserts," which

St. Luke cites from Isaiah by way of comparison, also ... prophetic of the certain issue of things, is thus interpreted by the Prophet: "have prepared *ye*," yè yourselves, ye for yourselves, ye by yourselves, "have prepared *ye*," &c., &c. This is in one respect jumped at by 'the Church;" only it has become a 'Peculiar'; the 'office' is appropriated by the κλῆροι, *cleri*, to place, person, "seasons, days, months, and years;" and then they amerce "the folks," the *vulgus*, and "spoil the Egyptians." But did not Isaiah proclaim this at large without respect of persons? Does not Luke adduce the burden of it as appropriate to John because it also so pourtrayed the indiscriminateness of his "heralding?" It was the mass, priests, people, officials, and all who set up class-distinctions, which John had not done. For whether or no priests proper were there, the participle στρατευόμενοι, will include them as well as all officials.

Having gotten such Peculiar 'established,' all else has seemed easy work, through the supineness or hypocritical deference of men for man in occult authority. It is admitted that this is all wrong, since the issue has thus plentified; but to right it, is perhaps hardly to be expected of man. To "make *such* crooked things straight, *such* rough places plain," would scarcely be less than suicidal. It is proverbial that in *civil* matters a Corporate Body has neither soul or conscience; but here is a "Spiritual Body" with both soul and conscience, which yet harks back to John and his *lawing* of things; though very consistently with "the *belief* once delivered to the saints," and with his whole course of life in the desert, he was "beheaded in prison." *This* was the proximate end of that corporate Peculiar; what of its Imitator? This is the very insane step for the *all but* taking of which St. Paul expostulates with the Galatians, iii. 1–5, aye, and with the Apostles too, ii. 11–21.

The *se-disants* Cleri I leave to themselves; but to my

fellows I appeal, that they may more steadily regard the veritable ῥῆμα θεοῦ, or "*thing of God*," which pervades the atmosphere *now*. How could this be so ineffective, being "*a thing of God*," if we were respectively *all* '*on duty*,' *on guard?* For, says the Lord, "What I say unto you I say unto all—Watch." Does the 'holy water' send us and soothe us to sleep for good and all, since its efficacy is interminable? as Augustine took the Latin word *balneum*, for *a bath*, to signify? Truly, according to Malachi iii. 1–3; iv. 1, 5, Elias's, that is John's, *bath* is a mighty different thing from this! And we shall see that it cannot be *done*, anymore than it can be *endured*, by proxy. It were quite as reasonable to expect that the Pope's own meal, in his own chamber at Rome, satisfied my belly here in England. Hunger is the test. Depend on it, friends, that if these passages of Malachi be true, a man in *that bath* which John "heralded" is in no easy berth for flesh and blood.

But I may be told that I am confounding two things. Am I? And if I be, am I singular? Assuredly not. Millions rely on the presumed efficacy of the priest's baptism. Take the following from Massillon's sermon on 'the death of the Righteous:'—"the only title dear to him was the one he received in baptism, which he bears into the presence of God, and which forms his claim to the everlasting promises." Tall words these, surely, even for a Romish 'Orator.'

But then, again, we are told that "the natural man understandeth not the things of God," although *this* "*thing* of God" is floating, and, as of yore, "hovering over" (Gen. i. 1) us in the very atmosphere of our minds; and, as a corollary, that we must "compare spiritual things with spiritual;" and that the whole of this is St. Paul's teaching. This is simply *false;* it is *not* St. Paul's teaching; that very word of E. V. "*natural*," which is the very hinge

on which the argument turns, does *not* translate St. Paul's word. And it is *known* that it does not, though it is thus very commonly used; the thought is not pleasant. It is *known* that St. Paul's word means *soul-like, every living animal* having such a *soul,* so-called in 'Genesis;' and that St. Paul means that such "a soul-like man," merely, "does not understand." The termination -κος, *-like,* denotes even the inferiority of a *man* to other *animals,* if having merely the *like* of such a soul while they have their originality.

Let there be no mistake about this matter, before we proceed further; though the word "*nature*" is reserved for the present. It is the "*soul-like* man," such as St. Jude says are "as ἀλογα ζῶα, *irrational animals,*" that "understandeth not the things of God." Quite in accordance with this, Coloss. iii. 3, and Rev. v. 6–10, this word ζωη (or rather the adjective ζῶός) seems to have supplanted the word ψυχη, as if the then futurition of Gen. ii. 7, εἰς ψυχην ζωσαν, LXX., were now present in some sort. Here St. Jude calls the very "brute beasts," as Rev., rather *animals,* ζῶα, only they are ἀλογα, "brute," rather, *irrational;* and speaks of those he is reproving as therefore acting φυσικως, "naturally-*like*," and *not naturally.* The whole Bible assumes that we are, or may, or can be, natural; not only *rational* (comp. John v. 38), but having our "*wits*" about us; or why address us? It is especially to this faculty that St. Paul addresses his first recorded sermon, that at Lystra, Acts xiv. 15–17; and that he appeals at Rom. i. 18–20; and which is sometimes contemptuously called '*natural* religion.' Would there were more of it!

These "*wits*" of ours, εἰδησις, which we can only recognize as a Faculty by συνειδησις, *consentience, consention,* or 'conscience' (but rather *con-scit-ure,* by analogy) may indeed be "seared as with a hot iron," so that we remain ἀπηλγηκοτες, *unpained* by its receipt of monitions; and how

far fig-leaves of hypocrisy, as well as fig-leaves of healthy shame, are responsible for this, 'twere hard to tell; but that we can habitually, persistently, consistently, become "past feeling," E. V., though it fall short of "*pain*" (which is Paul's word), morally, seems to be as incredible as to be so physically. We may become inured into indifference to, but scarcely to unconsciousness of, even the most ordinary test. The Latin makes a fine distinction by *sentio* respecting the *sensuous being* of a thing (*q. d.*, *ent.* sibilated) and *scio*, the *being able to tell* of it to one's own mind; but it is hard to pursue it. There *is* such distinction; and it is the latter which is synonymous with our word. It differs, if indeed it do differ, only temporally, or tensively, from "common faith," though this last point is hereafter discussed.

Now John's appeal is *not* to this very natural, quite common Faculty, our "*wits*," εἰδησις, avowedly. These, this, has been from the beginning, as Paul said at Lystra, and still is being constantly assailed by the common Law of things, by the diffused rays of the ῥῆμα θεοῦ, or "*thing of God*," everywhere around and within us. John's herald-appeal is to *the mind*, as St. Luke renders his words. It is in one sentence which E. V. thus gives:—"*preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.*" But, irrespective of the word *mind*, this is not a translation of St. Luke's Greek. I challenge any one interpreting that English version to answer whether he must not necessarily infer that "the baptism," there so characterized, is not what every body *is of course acquainted with?* The same may be urged in respect of "the remission of sins;" only that this is less disputable, because a few minutes' experience and self-acquaintedness easily tests that. As to "the baptism," then; somebody—why not all?—of those he heralded to, is *of course acquainted with it!* And yet here

is "My *angel*," (Mal. iii. 1,) and John, as an Elias, *a herald*, trumpeting forth this proclamation, forasmuch as it must be *a new thing!*

Here is something amazing! Had *the mind* really nothing to do with the old rite, but *the wits* alone, through grace given and taken, sufficed? It would appear so. And since *the wits*, the sensuous, had failed to reach the goal, and the Mind had but become the more inflated, ampullated, indefinitely, some *cognate of the wits*, some *core* of the mind, is, or are, to be *Ideified*, and *Thee-i-fied*. Can we fetch out any thing like this thought from our text?

This κηρυγμα, then, or *heraldment*, of John's, concise as it is, is sure to be pregnant as well as comprehensive. But here again the old Peculiar forces itself up in a new skin, which is indeed the old "coat of skins," but which had been sloughed off. Thus its terms have long been technical, even boxing up the meaning of one of them in its original Greek; and its applied meaning requiring Technics to make it effective; so much so that they are called *mystical*. Just so in my youth, we were accustomed to hear of the 'art and *mystery*' of every trade and profession, from a pedlar to a parson.

But, surely, since the cock-crow is to herald the dawn which is to "grow more and more until *broad daylight*," like "the morning spread upon the mountains," such a feature of the Mystic would have been grossly out of place in such a proclamation as John's was. What makes the cock crow at dead of night? What even *before* daybreak? Surely the mysteriousness (quite akin to these) of John's "voice" is amply accounted for by its booming up so forcefully from "the deserts," and not from another Sinai. 'What means it?' one fancies all men saying, some for one reason, some for another.

It is thus that, quite correctly and appositely, the question

about *the natural* crops up again. There is no doubting about the fact that Elias and John, as such, mean something uncommon, extraordinary. But if we are right as to the *diffused rays*, they were quite useless, except the ordinary, or as we above said, the *constant*, be in some sort, ever subsistent at least; not yet to say insistent; though I lay claim for that too while man is alive. This diffused *wonder awakened* in the various political, civil, and social circumstances, must, sure enough, have been *asleep* heretofore; but it cannot have been 'the sleep of death,' any more than the sleep of annihilation, or why all this Prodigious Undertaking? Those who compiled our famous 'Article' about '*quam longissime*,' did most assuredly see that they had not exhausted Human Nature. How then is it that their successors have preached that *nothingness* of a man, and yet the man persists in being the man? And that most unequivocally that "thing of God" hovers over him still? We have got wrong somewhere, somehow.

It is no answer to the above challenge to say that when Luke wrote those words, the thing was well known, as E. V. intimates. If it do not seem inappropriate, let Acts xix. 1–7 (so late!) refute it. The very idiom of Latin quite precludes *the writing* of such an idea in the Vulgate, however the priest's *reading* and toning of the Vulgate may foment it. It has unfortunately been reserved for our English version to propagate such a familiarity; and so the plain converse of this is still 'mysticism!'

It is, however, a far more sure and certain distinction that what John *proclaimed* and what he *did*, as a herald, differed most materially, relatively; and also absolutely, from what his Principal was to follow with. The text we have adopted as St. Luke's *sum* of what John did herald is a volume. St. John amply exhibits *our* John's self-disclaimer as to person; and John himself does the same as to his officialism.

He gives a plain simple reason for what he *practised*, John i. 31; which St. Luke omits; and then says, "I do baptize indeed you in water; but,"—or, *yet*, or *still!* And, for want of keeping this difference ever prominent before the mind, we may, by habit of the mind, be betrayed, "unawares," into confusion of very facts.

Keeping to the main translation of E. V. for the present, we, as usual, say truly enough that John's κηρυζις *amounted to* this text; and then he set about "baptizing in the Jordan." It is plain, then, that he did not think "proclaiming" enough; but that since he saw the great stir thereby induced, he, too, established and practised a "baptizing in water." This was very natural, as well as customary, in the East, and even, be it so, ritual among the Jews. And this is *besides* the reason he himself gives, John i. 31.

Ordinary sagacity would prompt a dirty man, with running water at his side, to plunge in and wash and be clean; and so the proverb runs, "Cleanliness is next to godliness." Carry out the natural idea to its utmost extent, and every step we take does but carry us further off, not only from the ways and means adopted in "the Law of Moses," but also from "*the truth* that is in Jesus," from "*the simplicity* that is in Christ."

Judging from what we see around us, one would think that there must assuredly be *two* "baptisms;" for we are not content to "*scarcely be saved*," but, somehow or other, get "fat and flourishing," carrying not "leaves only," but "fruit." There is, indeed, something most mysterious here! Most *brilliant 'cleanliness,'* indeed, is it in the eyes of those who *can* be washed clean "in water;" but very strange surely that an "angel" and a "herald," and his simple and very common ordeal, though with a terrible severity, should be necessary to teach the process; and that

now, forsooth, it can be practised by a priest's "sleight of hand."

The truth is, that while we persuade ourselves that all these and the like topics are to be "spiritually discerned," we do not so carry out the *ratio* of this in all directions, ways, points, by "the analogy of the *belief*," as to perceive that they are discernible only "by spirituals." There is a fatal aptitude, nay, 'propension,' as Bishop Butler calls it, within and about us to take things *literally* when it suits us so to do, and otherwise when the contrary is convenient. If we did but note the whole circumstances about "the Law" and John, or rather, more modestly, this one circumstance, that John "baptized in the river Jordan," which, unless it had been a river "*running*," would have been "filthy" as the *common sewer* of such a host of people and "very much cattle;" and, that the High Priest especially, but all the priests in their turn and 'order,' "practised" with *living* though *dying* "blood," our notion of *ritual cleanliness* would be the opposite of what it is.

I am perfectly satisfied that we gallop too fast into and through those first three wonderful chapters of the book 'Genesis.' When I say *we*, however, it were more correct to say *I*, have done; yet I am sure I am not alone in wondering at the so-called *flourishing* condition of "the Church." Heb. xi. exhibits a very different picture!

But come to the words; and first, "Baptism." The philological closeness, if not radical identity, of βαπτιζω, βαπτω, ἁπτω, would at once be granted on any other subject. The copiousness of the Hebrew synonyms for the received meanings of these words is, however, notable. The imagery introduced by the Hebrew words is quite as various as national habits and customs have established to gain one and the same end. While *these* remind us of the πολυμερως και πολυτροπως of Heb. i. 1, so *that* reminds us of the "one

faith, *one baptism*" of Eph. iv. 5. For instance, to *wash and clean, e. g.*, clothes, the subject we have in hand, I have seen people in India roll up the article and so *beat* it against a post in the river; whereas, in Scotland I have seen them *treading* the clothes in the river. Both these figures occur. Thus, in the great direction at Ex. xii. 7, where LXX. reads θησουσιν, *put, set, place*, the Heb. uses נגע, the usual word for ἅπτω, E. V., "*smite.*" While at Ps. li. 9, where E. V. reads "*wash* me," the Heb. uses כבס, "*tread* me," as in washing. "Comp. Gr. πλύνειν, as distinguished from λούειν." Fürst.

This same last verse also opens up a great prospect of what I aim to insulate in this paper; indeed, it contains the whole theme. "*Purge* me;" the Heb. reads "*Sin* me;" as Aaron did the altar, "*with*, or *in*, *hyssop*;" no doubt the "bunch of hyssop" wherewith the head of every family or house was to "*smite* the doorposts and upper lintel" in Egypt; "*and I shall be clean*," Heb. *shine, glisten*—being *scarlet* with the blood; "*wash me*," Heb. *tread* me, "and more than snow I shall become white." Do study the paradoxes here; "Sin me—and I shall be—sinless; tread me, and I shall be snow-white;" as if *trodden* "snow" were cleanest! The issue here contemplated by both clauses is "one;" "legal *justi-ness* or *righti-ness*." It takes a long, or an intense, experience to make us *justly* conceive Solomon's view of "the Spouse," "*I am black, but comely;*" for it is quite contradictory to our notions of *right* and of beauty.

Of βαπτω, it is singular that in N. T. there are but four places where it occurs; singular, because there are scores of βαπτιζω. Those four places, however, are pregnant; Luke xvi. 24, "may *dip* the tip of his finger"; John xiii. 26, *bis*; "to whom I, having *dipped* the sop, shall give it; Rev. xix. 13, "a garment having been *dipped* in blood."

In LXX. it is the usual word for טבל; thus Ex. xii. 22, "bunch of hyssop, and *dip* it in the blood," LXX., "*from* the blood," as if '*rinse*' was their sense of the verb; and Lev. v. 6, 17, "the priest shall *dip* his finger into [εἰς] the blood"; and many others. Whereas this same Hebrew verb is rendered at 2 Kings v. 14, *dipped himself*, by βαπτιζω.

This deviation seems to suggest that βαπτω had already become all but barren of import of its high original significance, when Moses first wrote the word in Hebrew. The *splashing*, no longer "sprinkling," perhaps, of the altar may have become a mere form; while the *soiling* of the dainty finger of a priest was often—*a nuisance.*

But this passage about Naaman, conveying as it thus does this view, contains much more. The prophet's message to him is, "Go, and *wash*——"; and Naaman's indignant reply, "may I not *wash* in them?" The Hebrew is רחצ, "*wash*;" which, "properly *intransitive*," is '*to bubble up, to flow, to pour out, to swell*'; that is, not only to *soak*, but, as "the Arabic, to *perspire much.*" The great radical ץ, is so connected in sound and alphabetical place in Arabic with ṭ, as at Gen. iii. 19, E. V. "*sweat*," that they perhaps allude to the same thing; only that the one will be *q. d. active*, the other *passive*. These, then, being the directions, we read ver. 14, "he *dipped* himself," LXX. "he *baptized*" himself," ἐβαπτισατο: Heb. וַיִּטְבֹּל; that is, that what he did at the hint of his servant, was *in spite of his 'fretting and fuming,'* his *anger*, and *jealousy*, and *reluctance*, as if *by belief, in spite of unfaith*, or of his ἀπειθεια. The feature which the story makes prominent is the *stir and repugnance* in Naaman's mind; and that to these the Prophet left him, having sent his remedial prescription to him. What, one might exclaim, left him *to nature*, as this is doing!

Now there is but one other instance of the word in LXX., but it is very pregnant. It is at Isa. xxi. 4, which Bishop

Lowth (making no mention in his notes) thus renders—"my heart is bewildered; terrors have *scared* me"; the LXX. reads, "my heart is adrift, is wandering (see E. V. marg.); the lawlessness *baptizes* me" (comp. Ps. cxix. 53). The Hebrew word here for "*baptizes*" means '*scared*,' as Bishop Lowth has it, but Fürst, '*frightened*'; the word is בעת, exactly like βαθ-ος. It is this last clause which is so important to our object.

As the antistrophe it cannot be taken out of *one's self*, for the strophe is "*my heart*"; and this ἡ ἀνομία of LXX. is in the Hebrew anarthrous and most expressive; פלצות, *smash, crash*, "*horror*," &c.; the *first* being the true sense, the others my own suggestions as consequents. We have here a mighty different thing from even Ovid's quiet '*rudis indigestaque moles*'; it is Chaos. The final radical ץ, prevents our comparing even the '*Philistines*,' פלשתי, with our word. It is a 'noun fem.,' as is LXX., ἡ ἀνόμία; and we may well compare 2 Thess. ii. 7, &c. It is surely our getting on so fast *through this*, that obliged the Romish Church, for very shame, to invent a Purgatory. But let *us* beware; such a Purgatory is worth a doit *only among* "*the living*," not among "the dead," where *they place* it.

If we have *idea'd* correctly what we have gone over, we must be prepared to see as much difference between Naaman's "*bath*," and Isaiah's, and David's "*bath*," as between day and night. Yet in their respective spheres each is alike wonderful, "secret," miraculous; for the one is an O. T. type of the other. If the idea I aim at has not been yet caught, the world is full of vivid lessons, whence we may perhaps learn illustrations. Have the many of the *Cleri* really ascertained the import? I would provoke all of us to the study of "the Law" *as* "*Law*."

I suspect that the difference between the *factual* and the *actual* has a very significant meaning, which is but partially

realised. John xi. 51, is a fearful passage for those who would revive the old *regime*. The difference, rightly appreciated, is that which can land us in the realm of "credit," credit with one's own self, as well as with others. There is a maxim, which is singularly impertinent if obtruded into this province, as one is apt to do, about '*qui facit per alium facit per se*,' which is urged immensely (though perhaps implicitly, and relied on even unconsciously) by many on the creditor's side, but more or less evaded on the debtor's side. Perhaps Ananias, in the passage of John above referred to, would rely as self-complacently on what he had done in fine linen and the mitre, as poor Nehemiah did at the rebuilding of Jerusalem, xiii. 14, 22, 31, at which he had necessarily, and not perfunctorily nor supererogatorily, endured as well as done. Poor Adam urged the same plea in Eden! Immunity, and even benefits, are claimed, though at the ignoring, or, may be, the most offensive flummery-ing, of the Instrument; blame and penalties are shifted, be the Instrument whom he may.

This is not "Law." The great question I would urge is, whether it can, anyhow, be "the Law," even of privilege? Every day, evidence swells up the verdict against its being so. Men, even the very *Clerí* themselves, are too *natural* to go this length in the practice of lies, though Ananias once *wore* "the Law" *natural*, that is, in the very teeth of their claimed privilege, when at the actual, real, very *pinch*. Now I claim only the same *naturalness* for men in general; and the refusal of it only provokes in its turn the 'Who are they?'—'what are they?' that presume to deny. Resentment is perfectly true to nature.

About the factual and the actual, then, I repeat, as giving a clue to what follows, and what is not generally perceived, though Ritualists in England are making it pretty plain in England, that the "baptism" which John "came heralding,"

and the baptism which John practised, are two different things; and that, too, most emphatically by John's own most emphatic declaration.

The word *βαπτισμα* is a completed fact; just as much so as *πνεῦμα*, "*spirit*," *ῥῆμα*, "*word*," or *matter*, or *thing*. This is our term in our text. This *βαπτισμα*, "*baptism*," *baptisma*, was as accomplished and perfect a fact in Naaman the Syrian, as was "circumcision" permanent in the Jew.

Again *βαπτισμος*, "*baptism*," *baptismus*, Heb. vi. 2, ix. 16, is an almost present vivid business; for this means the process *being endured*, "under the Law," and yet requiring continual repetition. But these are the only "baptisms" which *the Jew* was ritually familiar with. And it is of these which St. Paul says, in these very passages, as if because such "baptisms" were transient and connected with "the Law;" it is of these, and such like, that he says, "I cannot now speak particularly"; I will not bother myself nor you about them now. The "baptism," *βαπτισμα*, which he wants to see effectuated once for all, is "Christ in you, the hope—only *the hope*—of *δοξα*, or *very seeming*." Thus Peter too—Peter!—says, at length, "the like figure whereunto" is the being *verily drowned*, as was the fact with "the old world." Now, we must have our stand on a very different point of view from that we now occupy, to deem this terrible "*baptism*" identifiable in any measure or degree with those "divers washings," *or baptisms*, which, nevertheless, did remotely prefigure it, as St. Peter says. Noah, or "the eight souls saved by water," contemplating the *washed* world, should have had its counterpart, in some sort, in the offerer, the worshipper, who viewed the washing of his sacrificed victim. Yet, either or both of these, so far as sense can reach, and St. Paul, indeed, says even "*conscience*," satisfactorily (Heb. ix. 9), was defective. Why? Because they were

more *factual* than *actual*; done in another, and by another, more than in and by, or with, one's self.

It seems to be here that the great doctrine of "substitution" gets misplaced, or misapplied. For, whereas St. Paul argues "justification by faith," St. James virtually urges that "faith without works" is *imperfect*. Yet it is quite possible for the *actual* to be so complete or "perfect," virtually, that the *factual* becomes but accident virtually. There are two histories which seem illustrative of this, besides that of Abraham, referred to by St. James ii. 21, *et seq.*

The one is that of King Agag, 1 Sam. xv. (Heb. and Fürst) "And Samuel said, Bring ye to me Agag, King of Amalek; and Agag approached in fetters. And Agag said, Surely, passed has the bitterness of death." Fürst quotes *Kimchi* for the phrase, '*in fetters*,' though 'the ancients' go with LXX. and E. V. And does not the word חקל, "*spared*," *pitied*, at ver. 9, agree rather with the latter than with Kimchi? The loss of the battle, his being a prisoner, the delay until Samuel reached Gilgal, all wrought on Agag's mind, quite irrespective of any indignities or pityings. And surely, to a king, these constituted "*the bitterness of death*" actual; so that the factual of ver. 33, was almost as nothing as to many another brave man in adversity. To see the argument in Samuel's reply to Agag's apostrophe, we must remember that Agag is the sole relict of Amalek; of that Amalek who is expressly to be remembered of the Israelites; as Deut. xxv., and as here referred to in ver. 2, at Exod. xvii. 8. The prodigiously successful progress of Israel against all the nations of Canaan would now flash to a point in Agag's mind; and assuredly he would be "*baptized*," 'without benefit of clergy.'

The other and similar case is that of Jonah, in chap. i. The mariners there behave in a very natural-religious way,

seeing that more than an ordinary storm and danger were upon them. "So they cast lots," as was done long after in Jerusalem, Acts i., "and the lot fell upon Jonah." Then see their anxious solicitude, in ver. 13, to avoid what Jonah had himself told them was the expedient to attain their wishes; so different from Ananias' cool, *cold* reasoning, at John xi. 49, *et seq.* However, they could not succeed in their benevolent efforts, "for the sea wrought, and was tempestuous against them, wherefore they cried," so piteously, so feelingly! They did, after all, but as they were told to do.

But what of Jonah all this while, in such a scene? since he had said, at ver. 12, '*Sacrifice me!*' Comparing ver. 9, was not the *actual* "baptism" to him at that moment, and throughout the interval, greater, severer, than the *factual*, when the mariners "took up Jonah, and cast him forth into the sea"? Was he not *drowned* virtually, *before* the mariners threw him overboard?

There is, however, one other, an unique case—reserved, indeed, for another Paper, but apposite here too.

Jesus Himself, virtually collating Himself with "the servant that knew [*notioned*] his Lord's will [θελημα]," says, "A fire I came to have thrown upon the earth, and what [τι] will [*wish*] I if it already were caught up [*i.e.* '*caught fire*']? A baptism, too, I have to be baptized; and how am I constraining myself while [ἑως ὁτου] it be finished?" What means this last apostrophe, but that the *actual* "baptism" going on in self-constraint was bigger than the *factual* finish of it? And when, being finished "in the Garden" and at the last Passover (Luke xxii. 15), how much more—and in accord with Ps. lxix. 21 (Liturg. version)—through all this "agony" was "my body being broken," *actually*, as he was breaking "the bread" factually, than when "it was finished," was *factually* broken, on the cross? The "breaking mine

heart" was surely severer, as God's "rebuke," than the "breaking my body," at the hands of men, to "*the man* Christ Jesus." The *actual*, "from before *the* world's down-throw," was τελος νομου, "Christ—end OF LAW"; and the *actual*—a Christian, is the end of THE LAW; but the *factual* of the latter awaits its "finish" or accomplishment.

Now these are instances of "baptism" according to St. Paul's idea of it, as may be gathered from many places in his Epistles; as we may infer, too, from St. Peter's own impression from them, by collating his first Ep. iii. 21, with his last Ep. iii. 16. Observe that, in every instance, the legal delinquent takes the *actual* initiative, self-constraint, a "having come to himself," as the Parable says of the Prodigal Son; a fetching-in of all one's outsidings, and then a yielding to be decided from them all; to stand alone, shrunk, shivering, shrivelled to *almost nothing*, and yet conscious! This is "baptism" according to St. Luke and St. Paul.

This is not, indeed, so explicit in St. Luke — I mean, the difference between "John's baptism" (Acts xix. 3) and the "baptism" which John "heralded"—as it is in St. John's Gospel; as has already been intimated. Yet the distinctive arrangements as to time and place, which St. Luke holds to, as well as the prominence he gives to John's own declarations, amply shew how he deemed John's *practice* to be but casual, ephemeral, and προσκαιρον. Whatever more than this was accorded to it, he would deem purely Jewish and Legality-like; and would certainly fall into disesteem with him when John was ignominiously "beheaded in prison." As long as its purpose was in reaching its accomplishment, so long was it valid, and not to be confounded with the "beggarly elements" of Judaism which became evacuated shortly. Grant even that this very adaptation of an old rite to the new special purpose which St. John's Gospel states

John to have proclaimed and "confessed" emphatically, it still cannot sanction a prolongation of it beyond that purpose. As an innocent expedient, and familiar to the Jew in its meaning, it may be allowable; but, if more than this, it is very remarkable that no mention is made of it at Luke xxiv. 47; still more so, even, that the contrast is made quite prominent at Acts i. 5. It is, indeed, possible to read this verse by its initial ὅτι, = *Item*, as if "John's having baptized *with* water" were part of "the promise," as is "YE too shall be baptized IN Holy Spirit," &c. But then, that first clause could scarcely be included in "the promise *which ye heard of*, or *from, me*." So that not only does this seem excluded from the said "promise," but it is even introduced at all only to heighten contrast. It thus becomes a truly grave consideration how far the Christian Church has disadvantaged, nay damaged, the belief of the Jew till this day, by the prolonged adoption of a rite that would fain persuade him that not "*Jesus*, the Nazarene," but *Moses*, survives. For it is no such simple expedient for Fœderalization in 'the Church,' nor only a Sacrament or Form of Oath, but an *authoritative Power*, even by our Anglican 'Article.' Granting this, it scarcely seems a very wide nor an unwarranted stride to go the whole length of the Ritualist in the British Church, nay even of the Romish, in this matter. And, if in this matter, then in much more.

But the *heading* of the code of our 'Articles,' defended by 'His Majesty's Declaration,' makes no such pretension. The original Latin is somewhat less strong than the English in the Prayer Book. It reads thus: "Articles..... for the lifting away Dissention of *Opinions*, and the establishing of Consent in true Religion, edited by authority of the Most Serene Queen." What could be more becoming than to include all such matters under the term "*opinions*," '*agreed* upon by'... '*consent*,' and their edit by *Royal* authority? If

this be insufficient for 'the Church,' how can Rome make it more so? If Rome *can*, then the second paragraph of Art. XXV. holds good. If Rome *cannot*, then it may be maintained, quite as fairly as it may be disputed, that that paragraph *does not* hold good. The Gospel of St. Luke, and the Epistles of St. Paul, are adequate to the proof of this last proposition. But I confine myself in this Paper to the subject of "Baptism."

I must, however, make a break here, as I did not arrive at this pass *per saltum*, as would, perhaps, appear to be the case. In re-writing my pages for the printer, I find myself so ready to jump at conclusions, that, trying as it may prove, both to the patience of the reader and to the worth of the pages themselves, it will be more useful to present the original stepping-stones of my progress. Reserving, then, the resumption of the main thread from that pass as a *Second Part*, the ensuing pages are separated as a *Section*, and nearly as they were first written. The order *may* prove suggestive to those who will handle the subject from, I believe, a new point of view, better than I can. The leading master-thought, however, viz., *that what John* "HERALDED," *and what the same John* PRACTISED, *are not identical, if even analogous, did* flash *per saltum* like light into my mind, during an argumentative conversation upon the reading of the first eight pages with an able friend. And I find it, and some congeners, to be very valuable "keys" to many of the *wards* of this wonderful Bible.

Section 2.

As there can be no question about the grammatical force of John's word βαπτισμα, *baptisma*, that it is a pass. perf. part. *name*, so it will have appeared accordingly that it signifies *a fact* explicitly, rather than *an act*. Yet we are

not here dealing with the miraculous, whatever some would fain have us believe, as when "the man with the withered hand" was bidden "stretch forth thine hand; and he stretched it forth, and it was restored whole as the other." The *fact* indeed is stated by the name for the information of others, as the effect of what really was marked much more by *passion* than by *action;* nor is the latter at all patent except so far as the act of submission. But there must be latent more than this, unless it be altogether miracle; and then what becomes of the virtue of submission? It is at least so far more than a mere effect as it is a product or "fruit" of activity in the shape of capability.

When we come to collate John iii. 5, we shall discover the explanation of what really is paradoxical at first sight, though every physiologist recognizes what is meant very readily, in the shape of what he calls 'sympathetic action.' So the force of the Greek 'middle voice,' the 'aorists,' and if we could suppose a mixed compound of the Latin 'gerund' and 'supine' seem to aim at the interpretation. As for the Romish doctrine of 'doing penance' in anywise contributing either to the formation or to the effect of such *Bath* or "Baptism," it is just as preposterous as 'putting the cart before the horse,' not excepting even when "the Law" is still the pedagogue. I know there is a subtle point here at which this is disputable; even where "mercy and truth *meet* together, righteousness and peace *kiss* each other;" but then this point is *outside of* "*the Law,*" whereas Ritualism lays claim to Law, relies on Law. So does Popery, because the Roman *Empire* once being 'universal,' and, therefore, but only therefore, the Roman *bishop* being so much Petro-politan, '*semper eadem*' is the dogma, though the Temporality have long eluded her grasp. It is a remarkable instance of "the fatuity to which and by which *she* as well as "the creation was subjected," but

she ἑκοῦσα, *spontaneous*, that she still harps upon her 'holy water,' and yet provides for and expects the re-application of it individually ever and anon. Such a practice belies her doctrine; for while she professes to contend for "*one* faith," she thus refutes that there is but "*one* baptism." This apparent absurdity is perhaps avoided (as to *this* "sacrament") by the *practice* of the English Church, as it is by her 'Article;' yet on this latter point the bias of Rome, and, as is believed, of 'the Early Church,' will be found, I believe, to have been, and to be, too dominant.

The "Baptism" which John "came heralding" was most momentous in terms. Even the Jews, well acquainted as they were with legitimate priestly power and authority, said, "Who can forgive sins but God?" The Latin '*remissione*,' E. V. "*forgiveness*' in 'the Creed' is the translation of this word ἄφεσις of John; but however it be as an interpretation, it is no translation, even if it be correctly referred to ἀφιημι. Still, as the subject is a very large one, let this translation be accepted, but in the sense of *dismissal, discharge*. It thus comports perfectly well with the idea of *bathing*, or *washing*, the *baptismus* of the Temple ritual. It is thus that Naaman's case illustrates *baptism*, as we shewed at the outset. It also accords with John's metaphorical, typical *practice*.

But then note that this "*absence* [? ἀφεῖμι ?] of sin" is the measure of the *baptism*; and then collate 1 John i. 8, with ver. 9 (Greek). *This* scope of meaning seems to have its proper illustration in the case of Jonah. It implies that this *Bath* has been an ocean, shewing vortex of "the Law;" and, by Luke's quotation from Isaiah, this is "the way of Jehovah," which John came to tell us to so "prepare." Jonah was verily immersed in "the sea," and to him it was "an end of the law;" for implicitly he was "justified from *the* sin" (Rom. vi. 7) which he had then

committed, but virtually he was drowned thereby, "perished." Much more than any Romish 'penance' must have accrued there, just as remorse, regret, chagrin will ensue upon disaster; but nobody thinks them beneficial *per se;* they are distortions of benevolences; and even *in statu quo* doubtful as to beneficial effect. Nay, if such benefit were probable, that '*penance*' which Rome bids us '*do*' is like to breed mischief, by how much the active is exaggerated and the factual forestalled or distorted.

This is not St. Paul's estimate when he distinguishes one kind of "grief" from another kind, at 2 Cor. vii. He does not welcome even the true and graceful benevolences, acerb as they were, as means to the end, but as proofs of the end having been attained otherwise, which end was "grief κατα θεον, *after the manner of God;*" and, by John's figure, the having been bathed or baptized in "the way" John prescribed, in contrast with that which he practised. And "grief," as it is to us, overwhelming, exhaustive, yet so *petite* does it appear to him, that he says in one place it "is not worthy to be compared," and in another he scarcely finds hyperbole adequate. Truly Rome seems to have combined the audacious and the ridiculous! No doubt Rome has a way of explaining away the grotesque and of subliming the mystical; but for the cultors of common sense she undoubtedly 'misses her mark,' and that not judiciously.

And now, leaving all this, whence, what, is this *Bath* of John's? I use the word "*Bath*" from the Hebrew of Isa. xxi. 4, early quoted, as the *statu quo* of the *opus operandum*, before the *opus operatum* has ended in the 'perf. pass. participial' "*baptism.*' For this is what John's proclamation amounts to from the *initial* point of view; and until the *finial* point is *approximated*, not to say *quite final*,

although *transited*, the word *baptisma* is not a suited term. Whence, then, and what, this "Bath?" "Water?" Yes, indeed; but not such 'natural' water as flowed in the river Jordan, nor in the holiest Font that ever priest consecrated. It must be original, not vicarious, nor procuratoried, or it is invalid. "The *sweat* of the brow" in "the tilling of the ground" is the Bible's own figure, and the truth of the figure has had its natural exegesis ever since. Think then in this high sphere in which our microscopes, rather our telescopes, are expatiating, of that *sweating* process which lasts until "dismissal of sins" ensues! Thus intense, thus extensive, thus complete is the "*washing*" to be! And what then? Nay; "justification," "righteousness," is all we profess to yearn for. Although "the righteous scarcely be saved," *if safe*, that's enough for the fiducial. The historic and portrait picture of the real shipwreck in Acts xxvii. is surely prophetic; but somehow it seems to be not satisfactory. It seems a very considerable *bore* that dignitaries must perforce be 'slow coaches,' like the rest. Yet what means the prophet's exhortation to priests, people, and all—"in returning and rest shall be your peace; in quietness and confidence shall be your strength"? I say that "the *bore* or slavery of the φθορα, corruption," or *waste* of time, energy, effort, &c. (Rom. viii. 21), which was irksome in even Paradise, apparently, is so still. But this is "written for our learning." Now of this consists ὑπομονη, "*patience*," *subsidence*, which all the Apostles so delight to extol. It is even wonderful, after so many years of example and experience, that even hot-house forcing can stimulate the educated plant; this, however, it undoubtedly does, and men "love to have it so." This is very wonderful in the nineteenth century since Christ!

All this only shews that we have not done with the pre-

tensive validity of water-baptism as somewhat more than 'a means of grace;" less indeed now in that matter than in some of its congeners.

Take then another passage in which St. Paul is concerned, where Acts xix. 4 thus summarises John's actual official practice as being quite defective in Paul's judgment. Accordingly, he who proclaims "one belief, one baptism," "imposes his hands on them" *after* "they were baptized *anew* into the name of the Lord Jesus." What means this, at one's first impression from the whole passage?

The original (of Lachmann's and the Sinaitic Texts) in its first clause, if taken alone, seems to vary from what I have above said about John's "*heralding*" and his *practice*. All hinges, however, on Paul's own word λέγων here, which *lies down the law* of the case. Read thus: "Paul too said [εἶπε], 'John baptized baptisma of *repentance* to the people, *liging down the law* unto Him coming μετὰ αὐτὸν, *after him*, so that they might believe, that is, unto the Jesus." The place of the first comma in Paul's speech is important, which should be after λαῷ; then the comma after λέγων should probably be cancelled, since ἵνα comes in afterwards awkwardly otherwise. Read then in this way, St. Paul concedes all honour and virtue to John and *his* "baptism" (ver. 3), and yet in express terms quotes his words as referring to *One* then future, "so that they might believe," *i. e., a further future.*

The only hitch remaining is that St. Paul here says that "John *baptized* baptism of 'repentance.'" Now St. Luke does not record this; for he expressly says that John "came *heralding* this." Although then St. Paul, writing or speaking some twenty or thirty or more years after John, can thus *interpret John's meaning, translate John's figurative practice*, yet the figure acquires hereby no more than figura-

tive force still; and I believe that the position I have taken is not at all shaken. Besides, St. Paul's own word about it, λεγων, "*leging* unto the one coming," quite sufficiently carries the popular mind away from any fancied *magical* virtue in the figure on to what it prefigured.

And here again is a distinction plainly discernible; that λεγων, "*leging*," is applied not to the "baptism," though it be "baptism of repentance," only to the Person — "Jesus;" whereas the "baptism" applies "to the people", whom he "warned" to proceed to *that* Bath, and not rest in its *type* which John *practised*. But viewing this passage as St. Paul's *interpretation* of St. Luke's record of John's behaviour and doctrine seems adequate to the occasion. If not, let all Paul's own pregnant Epistles testify.

After this it is hard to grant, what however may be conceded for history's sake, that water-baptism in John's hand (for he is the real *human* author of this new application of it) is a *legal* instrument, "the people" were as far from the Property it is now assumed to *convey*, as the seal of a deed is from the estate recited on the parchment. Even apart from John's own emphatic repudiation of any such virtue, no where (in Luke and Paul) can even a slip of the pen be detected which can hint the contrary. It is not indeed clear whether what John said to class after class was before or after or during his baptizing of them; and so there is room for St. Paul's strictest and largest *interpretation* of what John *in figure* taught as well as practised. But it seems settled by our Doctors that 'the Early Church' did take up this ancient rite of John's new adoption (by Divine intimation, John i. 33), and it has been followed. Whereas St. Paul, on the very occasion we have been just considering, "*laid his hands upon*" these re-baptized ones; and also "laid his hands" on Timothy, whom he *had*

circumcised, and had *not* Titus, as if that were equivalent. Indeed he brings the whole matter into a nutshell at 1 Cor. i. 22, and virtually discards all.

Now, properly, the educated adult 'Protestant,' as becomes a Gentile, sees this matter more or less in the same light as the Apostle of the Gentiles saw it and taught; but it is very questionable whether it has been realized by many. The difficulty is not a little complicated by the evidence of baptism, copied from the Registry, being required in our Courts of Civil Law. They too have adopted the same practice in their demand for such certificate. It is very beautiful that it should be so, in spite of religious abuse, in the eyes of those who deem the Estate to be the Church. We thus not only profess implicitly the religious void, but we nevertheless comply with the Civil law-test. So by force of one we get hampered by the assumptions of the other. To unravel this knotty subject would require more effort than I have mind to bestow. Religiously it may be left to St. Paul's advice on a similar matter,—"Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind."

Again, we may compare the prevailing idea of "Confession" as being quite lamentably, mischievously below the Gr. ὁμολογησις, and, perhaps, the Scottish '*homologation*.' Water-baptism falls just as short of the baptism heralded by John, and which is the burden of the Gospel; but then, is not the practice of it liable to great abuse?

The simple solution and reconciliation, "in my own mind," corresponds pretty closely with the servant's reasoning to Naaman, compared with Naaman's un-reasoning with himself. The whole story is very suggestive in this connection; only there we have the potent miracle *beyond* the exercise of the believing un-faith of Naaman. His servant was the mediator between Elisha and himself. Just so lies hereabouts the very kernel of privilege, prescription; all the

isms in the world have adopted their individual *shamrocks*, for instance; but somehow or other these come to be their 'glory!'

There is one other point which arises here. John says, "I do baptize indeed you in water." Although the *baptismus* be thus relatively certain, that is, on *his* part, yet it is not so certainly absolutely that the *baptisma* has taken effect on the "you," though both parties be "*in* the water." Whatever of argument there may be in this thought is anticipated at Ezek. xxxiii.; and there the "sign" spoken of is the blowing and hearing of *a trumpet*, the taking or not taking "*warning* thereat. And note there that not Ezekiel is the official, but "a man of their coasts, taken by the people, and set for their watchman." So John, somewhat "more than a prophet," yet less than a regular official, is "sent to prepare the way of Jehovah." Both are under the 'Law-dispensation.' Thus the "*trumpet*" of the one, and the "*water*" of the other, are alike old "*signs*" of the Law-Institution. John makes use of both; he "heralds," proclaims, or 'preaches'; and he "baptizes with water" upon application by the people. But in both cases the whole benefit is made to depend upon *their taking* "*warning*." And I conceive that this is implied by St. Paul, as the indispensable preliminary condition for benefit, at Acts xiv. 9, "seeing, *Item*, he has belief of the being healed," or *saved*, although on another occasion he could strike Elymas blind. In short, Article XXVI., respecting both 'Sacraments,' and the third rubric in 'the Communion of the Sick,' respecting the other 'Sacrament,' so justly resolves the whole benefit derivable into the *belief* of the recipient, that the English Church at least should be free from all suspicion of pretension to such affectation of power as is claimed for Ritualism. So that this really becomes a most terrible delusion, or worse, to both parties. Perhaps ignorance may prove a valid plea

for the one; but it cannot be even named on behalf of the other.

To return to the question above asked about this "Baptism," or even the *Bath* which affords it, whence is it? What is it? We speak of a 'water-bath,' 'vapour-bath,' and the like; understanding what they mean. We must take this Bath, too, in precisely the same way, though with a difference in effect. If a man *die* in a bath, as too commonly happens, though we outsiders call it a *bath* still, it was no mere '*bath*' to the *drowned* man. Although, then, in previous pages, these terms are used as if convertible, we must now strictly adhere to a distinctive meaning. The word "bath" *does* occur in another connexion, which requires its own distinct sense; but this we reserve. There is one instance, however, in the Apocrypha, out of the two where "baptize" is used, which is important as to meaning.

The first instance of "baptize" is at Judith xii. 7, where LXX. reads, "and she was going out night by night into the valley Betulia, and *was baptized*, or *baptized herself*, in the camp [παρεμβολη, *tent*?], upon the fountain of the water." The connexion of the story shews somewhat more than ordinary import in the term, though this was attached to her ordinary and customary behaviour for ablution.

The other instance is at Sirach xxxi. 30, LXX. (E. V. xxxiv. 25), "*One* being *baptized* from a dead (*body*), and again touching of it [ἁπτομενος], what profited he by his *Bath* [λουτρῷ]?" Here we have our *three* great words brought together; and as βαπτ-, and ἁπτ-, (the latter being the great word in 'Exodus,' as shewn before,) are well brought into distinctive relation, while yet akin as to meaning, for both are *external* in appliance and use; so does λουτρον suggest λυτρον, as I think we shall be able to shew St. Paul's *distinctive*, and yet *akin*, meaning of both. But of this by and by, most likely in a second *Part* of the subject.

Here we are concerned with John's *baptisma*. Now this he calls '*baptisma of "repentance,"*' E.V. not "*the* bapt." nor "*the* remission," as E. V., any more than *the* repentance, *the* sins, for which there is equal right. And why is it not adopted here too? 'Early Church' history must answer, one would expect; but, at any rate, the Latin Vulgate is not responsible, for the Latin has no true 'article,' and therefore cannot so write the Greek. It will be interesting to know what Ulphilas has made of this passage. Luther's version is thus: "preaching *die Taufe der Busse* for remission *der sünden*." The French (Amsterdam 1797) has "preaching the baptism *de* repentance en remission *des péchez*." It is striking to see how the article is thus made to exhibit something well known, or at least familiar; but which of the *items* is so among different peoples?

All, German, French, and English agree in "*the* baptism," but Luther alone speaks of "*the* 'repentance,' 'remission,'" or, as the German very characteristically signifies, the *requital*, the *atonement*, &c., of the sins." Hilpert says that *busse* is 'allied to *besser*, *bass*.' I would suggest, also, the English *buss* for 'kiss'; and compare an English mother saying, 'Come *kiss* me, and be a *better* boy.' But this is going a great deal too fast; and yet it is the sense for which the Latin Vulgate is perhaps responsible, only we must omit the 'articles' in every instance, as does John.

Section 3.

The Vulgate for μετανόια has *pœnitentia*; and this, of course, carries us to ποινή, having the same sense as the German *busse*. I am sure that this is not John's meaning, though it have been even the Jews' meaning in our Lord's days; Matt. v. 38, 43; and was reproved and corrected.

Under this word, Liddell and Scott say, 'confer δίκη (which is the common word in prose), ἄποινα.' But this

would bring in too much, as I have said, for John's word. Thus compare 2 Thess. i. 8, 9, E. V. "*taking vengeance,*" but rather "*giving vindication,* or *out and out justice*"; "*who shall be punished,*" E. V., but rather "*who shall honour, estimate, justice.*" So again Jude 7, E. V. "*suffering the vengeance,*" but rather "*upholding justice,*" or *sustaining* it; with ver. 15, E. V., "*to execute judgment,*" but rather "to *have made crisis* and confuted all," &c. Thus Liddell and Scott add under ποινη (the Latin *pœna*) personified, "*the Goddess of Vengeance, Vengeance;*" but well further add, 'a Being OF THE SAME CLASS with Δικη, and 'Ερινύς,' *i. e. Justice* and *The Erinys,* like the Roman *Furiæ.* This last comparison with '*Fury*' quite tallies with πυρι, "*Fire,*" which John expressly and emphatically says, is "coming after" him and his baptism; and that to the effecting of which he is utterly inadequate.

It is, then, a very remarkable error of exaggeration and ἁρπαγμον which the 'Early Church' thus committed, if Jerome has correctly expressed John's word by *pœnitentia.* That it is correct is probably inferrible from the verb, *pœnitentiam agere,* to *actuate penitence,* and then thence to *act* or *do,* penitence or 'penance.' However unintentional such usurpation originally was, yet since all this connexion has got perverted into the sphere of *Law, Justice, Compensation, requital,* &c., as a means to acquittal or 'absolution,' one is forcibly reminded of the chapter following that, in 2 Thess., from which we above cited, and by contrast to 'the sermon on the mount,' also referred to.

That it is exaggeration, perversion, let us ask how "eye for eye, and tooth for tooth," can be compensatory? *Cui bono?* Who derives benefit? What of *good* can possibly accrue to him, I being blinded by a similar loss? Can the gratification, if such there be, be healthful to him? My penalty can but gratify his revenge, not restore his eye to him, nor, in

the matter of *justice*, would the penalty of a world make another *eye* to him. It does not become us to press this argument about *cui bono* beyond our own proper province. Enough for us to read, "Vindication is for me: I will requite, *leges* Jehovah." *Within* our province it has all the look of not only injustice, but of absurdity; for what equivalence is there between a whole world and an eye?

On every ground, however, we may, then, be quite sure that while John "heralded" such terrific issues, he did not *pretend* to them with his modest and yet significant *water-baptism for ablution*. On the contrary, while *practising* his modest rite, but giving it its tremendous interpretation by voice, manner, and behaviour, he utterly and emphatically disclaimed all responsibility, throwing it entirely upon "*the people*" themselves quite indiscriminately. How the 'Early Church,' as if out of Matt. xxviii. 19, Mark xvi. 15—18, came to adopt water-baptism, along with several other 'sacraments' which the Romish Church has retained, may, I believe, easily be attributed to the tenacious hold of Judaism upon those who were not Jews outwardly, nor circumcised outwardly in the flesh. High and deep reverence or respect, so natural, will readily account for it; but as John came to introduce the limit of privilege, so Paul came and "earnestly contended for the *belief* once delivered on to the saints," as the almost *extreme* limit of a safe naturalness. With such a text, however, before him, and the writer of it too his companion, as Acts i. 1, 2, *Greek*, St. Paul does not choose to dispute the *practice*, not even at the great occasion at Antioch, Gal. ii. 11; neither does he explicitly disgrace it, any more than "imposition of hands," as he certainly does "circumcision," by shewing any danger in either. He argues, as also respecting the whole Jewish ritual in Hebrew, the inaptitude, the unsuitableness, the absence of all fellowship and communion, between mere commerce, of things so totally,

intrinsecally different; just as Jesus did with Nicodemus, at John iii. And so the poor Jews, if appealed to, could feelingly tell us how genuine, how sincere was the Christian's reverence or respect for them for some eighteen centuries! It was all 'superstition' from the beginning!

We venture to conclude, then, certainly that *pœnitentia, penitence,* or the '*doing penance*,' is neither the meaning nor pretension of John's word. It would be nothing else than *the putting of effect for cause.* What, then, does it mean?

Let us see the Hebrew sense. It is not a little curious that we find its nearest etymological form in the Book of *Proverbs.* Thus, E. V.—

xiv. 15, "The prudent man '*looketh well to his going.*"

xx. 25, "and after vows *to make enquiry.*"

xxiv. 32, "I saw and *considered* it well"; marg. '*set my heart,' q. d. to it,* where the Hebrew is '*set it to my heart.*"

When we come to the Prophets, we come to a sense which I hope to educe, differing from what we entertain, which is identical with μεταμέλεια. For instance, 1 Sam. xv. 29, the word is twice rendered "*repent,*" along with οὐκ ἀποστρέψει, E. V., "*will not lie.*" The text will be reconsidered. So again, Jerem. iv. 28, viii. 6, xviii. 8, all "*repent,*" and other places. *Trommius* has *resipisco* as a second meaning for the Hebrew; and see Andrews on *resipiscentia.* But this is the same *advanced* thought; *resipio* would be nearer the sense, but even that is too much. When, then, we thus find all our authorities running on the same rail, it requires some courage to either diverge or hesitate. However, therefore, I happen to express myself, I would speak with modesty, though not with diffidence, because I am persuaded of the security of my clue to the purpose.

There is no difficulty about the primary etymology of

our word into μετα-νοια, μετα-νοεω. No one will dispute so far. But each of these etymons, as well as the compound word, requires its own analysis. When I attempt this then, using as I must do the tools of Experts for the purpose, but with the enthusiasm of a hearty scholar, and submit my 'Exercise' to my Teachers, whom, thank God, I do unfeignedly revere, I rely confidently on that forbearance which every superior delights to accord to a possible Neophyte.

I attempt the noun first, *voĭă*. I dare say many think that they know all about this; perhaps they may discover that they do not. That it is compound is certain. I treat it in the form of the *noun*, which it is, first, and then as a verb.

The terminal suffix (by the 'New Cratylus') would be regarded as synonymous with the old English form *ie*, now *y*, as '*leprosy*,' *e. g.*, is printed in our old Bibles '*leprosie*.' And though the Sanscrit original furnish this, how much nearer are we to its force hereby?

Without wading here through a school-boy's rubbish and chips again, and leading my reader through, I offer my show-room.

And, first, I say that the real terminal suffix is the simple *a*. This makes the noun substantive, which is *a piece* of Eng. *y* = *ie*.

Further, that the *ĭ* is an *attributive* to any root or stem which is preconized and consented to. That it may not belong at all to the noun-suffix *a*, though it be now the other piece of Eng. *y*, unless, perhaps, as a *derivative*; when, granting this, it becomes indeed the real valuable of *a*, which together = *y*, *ie*.

Clearly then the important element is, the *derivative ĭ*. It may be identical with the '*iota subscriptum*' of the 'dative' case only. In this association, that is, with the *α*,

it could form the '*instrumentative*' or the '*locative*' case, because it becomes a prefix to *α*, whencesoever derived.

That is the point. For there is but *one ι*, which has to serve both as prefix and suffix, as derivative and attributive, according as it is annexed. And it will amaze, I am quite sure, those who are not used to such analysis, to discover the vast difference of import by this distinction. Take similarly made words, *e. g.*, *ἀπις-ι-α*, *ἀπειθε-ι-α*, and compare *πιστις* with them, and *in fairness* they must be puzzled. Of course it is perfectly easy, not in this instance only, but, wonderful to say, in millions of others which are fatal, to jump to a conclusion; though only to discover ultimately the unfairness of such behaviour. I am quite open, confessedly, to the same charge if I take this *-ια* as equal to *-ie*, *-y*, but that the hyphen betokens the liberty I am so taking. On the other hand, I am chargeable with robbery if I say that the final suffix *α*, though it be the nominal formative, can depict the noun intended. This would be just the noose in which the Ritualist would fain catch us. It is *safe* then to say that *α derives* from *ι*, something which constitutes its particular virtue or value.

But all this was derivative in such nouns, not from the isolated *ι*, but from the suffixed *ι*-attributive of the compound it belongs to, as compounded therewith. I say *compounded*. For, whatever be the real value of the *iota subscriptum* generally, in such words as those above named, the *ι* cannot be called *subscriptum*, because it is openly advanced *to the level* of its coadjutors. In this instance it is *νοΐ-*. This is not so simple an affair as it looks.

Though the suffixed *ι* be thus accounted for as an *attributive*, we have not therefore explained it. Nor indeed need it be claimed here for our purpose, except on the score of its possibly being an element in our word.

The stem or root looks like *νο*. I take the liberty of

expressing my admiration of Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon, in this among other instances. Under νεω, we read,—"the υ or *f* of the fut. PROB. *belongs to* the Root." Mark the value of the words, however '*accidentally*' they may have been written.

There is such a "belonging" of the root or stem of which it cannot be bereft, strip it as we will. It may be *represented* by the copulative tentacle of any mollusc; though "*probably*" it does not amount to so much.

But the same *probability* belongs to the *i* attributive or contributive also, as philology abundantly proves, by our English word *self* alone. An *elf* or *elfin* is veritably a ghost or goblin; a *self* is something *else*. Therefore, acting as it does fore and aft, it not only endows νο-, but it is the whole dower of α, and much more when advanced to par. Is it then the sole valuable? By no means.

For νο must be somewhat capable of not only being dowered, but endowed. Although Ritualism then may make a noose out of the latter, it ought not to become such a noose, as, through νο-'s negligence, can catch νο. '*Ought* not'! On this ground consult Rom. v., where the Apostle appears to be working at this very analysis. But what is the apparent truth in these days of ours?

If we take νο nakedly as it thus stands, we cannot escape the view of the *dual* form of the first pers. pron. at the same instant. And I suspect that that is really the primal root, though at the same time it be compound. I look to the *suppressio veri* of Gen. iii. 12, and see the virtual *not I*, but "the woman," and so on; thus taking this most difficult letter ν as a negation. Do we then so dispense with the digamma? I answer, "*probably*" not. For the English "*we*," — and we have not a pure *dual* which might test it (Mrs. Elstob gives the Anglo-Saxon as "Sing. *Ic*, Plur. *we*, Dual *wit*," *i. e.*, terminal only), is formed of the *two*

digammas *v v* = *w* or *y* in some cases, as if something like *one* of them belonged to something else which bears the *other*. Further, I would not be surprised to learn that the origin of the usage of a Royal Person, writing '*We*,' instead of the vulgar *I*, were here. But carry out the thought as in Rom. vii., and we shall find it impossible to isolate a self *per se*. Nay, higher, Heb. ii. 13, "I and the children" are a *parcel*, so to speak. But here am I, too, being allured beyond my province; so I leave this pronoun-part of the subject with the suggestion that "probably" a digamma-force *ought* to "belong" to every radical as well as stem, both in logic and grammar.

From this speculative then I return to what we have seen recognized under νεω. From this verb, νο would be regularly formed as a 'mid. voice' form, just like νομος, λογος, &c. But however much the digamma *ought* to belong to its present tense, it appears only in its future, which is of midd. or pass.-voice form. Therefore, it does not follow that because we write νοf, or νοofς, and νοῦς, νοfυς or νοwς, we may also write νοf, or νοof, as the stem. To express this so would perhaps beget the same error, as I am persuaded it is, as to write *nature, creature, feature, &c.*, formed from the Latin fut. *in rus*. For the word in νοία aims to express a thing *present*, since *baptisma* is what is passed, and not a thing *future*. Neither is it = νοησις anymore than νοημα. But it aims, knowingly or unknowingly, to express a stripped and naked stem, which I suspect to be identical with the dual of the first pers. pron. similarly treated. I cannot get loose from this impression if it is to be damaged by my so doing.

So then since νέω = *no, natans*, as that is a *swimming*, or rather *floating*, for our purpose; object or subject being already in accord with the figure of Baptism, and a Bath.

Now I verily believe that unless we try to realize this

floating or *adrift* state (like the fœtus in the Liq. *Amnii* !) we do not conceive the idea of mere, pure *Mind;* nor even of Jonah just being cast overboard and falling—"into the sea." If we do try to realize it, that is comprise it, it so eludes our grasp, is so subtile, so indefinite, and may be infinite in capability, that we shall soon confess perforce that we can know but little about it. Yet it has *a law of its own* nevertheless. *To this John addresses himself.*

It may be noticed further in passing, in connexion with the pronoun-idea above pressed, that the Latin m-*ens*, or me-*ns*, me-*ntis*, and the English *mind*, have not only the obj. case prefix, but that remarkable suffix *n*, the '*twang*' or *tenwin* (*tenuin?*) of the Arabic and the *anuswâra* of the Sanscrit. This amounts to thus much; that *I* cannot say of *my mind* as other than *me*, in some way or other. So that, in short, every one of us must *consent* and *agree* to every one else's consent and agreement as to what we all mean by νοῦς, that is, "*mind.*" But now, further; on the supposition that it is a *Faculty* essentially, we must agree to name νοία, or *Thought*, the *faculty* or ideal operated excerned product thereof. That as *ear* produces, proximately, *hearing*, *eye*, *seeing*, as instruments, so νοῦς, *mind*, the thinking *Facultas* of which the Brain is the instrument, produces *Thought*, νοησις, νοημα, of which νοία is to be regarded as the simplest element.

There are two passages I will cite, one as a caution, the other as an explication. The caution is at Heb. xi. 3, where E. V. goes the whole length of saying,—"by faith, *i. e.*, *belief*, we *understand* that"—&c.; where the Greek is this verb, we *mind*, *think*; perhaps, as qualified "*by belief*," it may amount to *we bear in mind*, only that that would entrench on *memory*. The explication may perhaps be found in Eph. iv. 17, 18. Here the Ephesian 'converts' are warned 'that you scarcely still walk just as also the nations walk in fatuity of their

mind [νόος], they being darkened *by*, or *with*, the διανοία" that is, the *divided* '*thought*' or *thinking faculty*, *q. d.*, which '*distracts*' the thought, &c.; and further reasons are assigned from other elements of our constitution. This word διανοία is formed on the same model as μετανοία; and it follows that if the one be, so the other will be, a faculty. We shall have occasion to consider this word in another connexion.

Against the *pronoun*-connexion, it may seem at first sight that we have a better idea in our word "know." That our etymon νο is compounded into it is very probable. But whereas the verb νοέω, or νοϝεω, or νοεϝω, whichever it can be, if either, in the present tense, the ο must be doubled into ω to form γιγνωσκω. It is true that some Lexicons have a form γνοω; but Hederic, and Liddell and Scott have not; and on their judgment we may rely. If, then, this etymon be there, it is not only altered by the prefix γ-, whatever that be, like our *k*-now, but the other etymon becomes -οσκω, subj. -οω, for -εω of νοεω. Moreover, since the Latin preserves the digamma in past tenses, *nosco*, *novi*, *nôtum* = *novitum*, and the pres. does not, so neither has the Greek *pres.*, if indeed the other Greek tenses do; and our word *know* therefore is a '*perfect*' tense. But still Liddell and Scott consider γνο as the root, and refer to ἀ-γνο-εω. If this be so, γνοω, for γνοεω, probably does carry the digamma latently, which is patent in *novi*, *nôtum*, and is therefore a quite different word from γιγνωσκω.

But however this be, the prefix γ = *k* is quite sufficient to distinguish this word from our etymon νο, or νοϝ; just as the actually *knowing* a theme differs from *thinking* it as a thesis. We therefore probably have not a better synonym for νοεω than *to think*, and for νοία *thought*. But then there is no such word as νοία *per se*, as we have ἴδεα, though analogy justifies it. The actual occurrence, however,

is only *such compounds* as above given. Its real sense therefore is something *more abstruse* than our word *thought* conveys; yet I know not a better word for it.

We may then suppose that not νο, but νο-, as being somewhat more vague or indefinite than *f*, is the true root of our *verb* νοεω; after the manner of the Hebrew *mappik;* and so is *maqque-ph'd*, as distinguished from the full *copula;* and then take εω as the common substantive verb. But in *nouns*, such as νο-ι-α, whose main root must correspond with the verbal root whence it springs, the whole occupant of the interval between νο-α, is still short of a *copula*, though it be expressed by *i* = *y*, or *w* = *v v*, that is, literally, a *di-gamma.*

This being so, our word is explicitly *pictorial* — as indeed all letters are; but this represents a special *dilemma* or duality, for which the Greek has η and ω for ε and ο, but none for α and υ (because ύ is not *one* character), nor, which is notable, for ι; neither has the Hebrew, unless יו be יִ, as I believe they are, the analogues of these forms. This being so, then, our pictorial *i* = Hebrew י, as distinguished from ι, יִ, and the English *j*, *y*, *w*, as distinguished from I *capital;* for perhaps in all languages of Latin origin the *small i* is a dual character or symbol. Thus we cannot, but by violence, so strip the root of our word *naked* as to deprive it at least of its "shame" or modesty; and this fact or truth is most beautifully brought out at Gen. iii. in the behaviour of our first parents with their fig-leaf "aprons" or 'girdles.' But as far as it may be stripped so as to leave an entity at all capable of supporting either name or tribute, so far does νοια aim to express *mere, pure,* simple "Thought;" but in its most abstruse form. But it is *not nothing;* it is not *scarcely anything,* absolutely; on the contrary, it is man's highest *native* faculty, or rather the *natural product* of the *native Facultas* — "mind;" and I insist on the

necessary *naturalness* of it, because John or "the Law," and Jesus or "the Gospel," and so the whole Bible, appeals to it, or why do They address us? It is this *native-born* or *natural* position which I labour to attain and exhibit in some degree; for I am confident that we are too *usuriously* inclined to grasp at the liquidation of *our debt* without payment of the *interest* which is not only our duty, but which it is in our power, to pay.

And this brings us to another associated theme — *the Will.* I shall not indeed directly attempt to analyse here; but simply advance two passages which can furnish explication.

Our Lord with pain upbraids the Jews thus: "Ye WILL not to come unto me," &c. He had elsewhere said, reading the verb as *ind.* not *imp.*, "Ye do search the Scriptures; *Item,* ye do THINK that in them ye have 'eternal' life." Now in last clause the verb THINK is δοκεῖτε, *ye opine,* ye are so far towards *glorifying* them, that it is not necessary to merely "*think*" in the ordinary sense of the word, νοεῖν, about them as at all open to doubt. It follows then, that, since "ye WILL not to come to me;" since this *to will* is the result of determination, "ye will — *not to come;*" and since the "mind," vast as are its powers, cannot but canvass me and my mind-offices, that is, that you cannot but "*think unto Me,*" — that "you WILL," deliberately, *not to give me even 'the benefit of a doubt.'*

That the *Will* is thus a real and natural exegesis of the *mind* may be gathered from the other passage, Rom. vii. Here St. Paul writes of "I WILL to do," — and "I WILL not to do," &c.; and then says, not that he *cannot* do, that is referred to another faculty, φρην, but "that I do not do." (Nothing can be more expressive than the parenthesis in ver. 18.) And he sums up thus: "I see too another law (ἕτερον νομον) in my members on duty as a soldier contrari-

wise to the law of my MIND," &c. Here then, powerless as *the will* is in effect, it is exegetical of *the mind* as of "*the within man.*"

Now I maintain that it is to this "within man" which is "me the prisoner to the law of ἁμαρτία [DOUBT?], that law being in or among my members," or constituent parts or portions of my organism; that it is to this "*within* man," which is also "*the old* man," that John addresses his herald-proclamation. His *practice*, too, metaphorically is not, as we would suppose from "Baptism," to become a "putting on the new man," and which he reserves for "One that is coming after him," but the washing off of "the old man with its passions and lusts," "the filth of the flesh," as Peter says. That is, his practice was primarily and proximately a process of *loss*, of *stripping*, and not one of *redressing* us. Nay more. Since there is "the inability of THE Law [*i. e.* of Privilege] wherein it lacked power through the flesh," *inability* "*to comply towards beneficial issue*, that ἐπερωτημα which Peter writes of, or RESPONSION of a good, *i. e. profitable* CONSENT, or conscience," that is *compliance* as contrasted with mere *supineness* or *gerundialism, is to be* expected, *is* expected, and is "acceptable to God," and our "*logical latria.*"

Toplady beautifully expresses this thus:

> "Sweet to lie passive in His hands,
> And know no will but His."

But can this be looked for *naturally*? Barring the '*sweetness*' which Toplady found, nothing less than this is worth calling a "preparing the way of the Lord." If we recall aught of what was said about the actual and the factual, and the range of sympathetic action in the *natural* world, we shall readily imagine that it is no "light thing" to think of—the exhaustion of the *natural* man which we are

considering here, in reality. It is a *life-long* process, and then a "death," rather, *a having defuncted*, or *defunctioned*. Even in physics, how often are we astonished at the amount of endurance even a sick man is capable of; how much more a physically sound man? But in the province of morals, in the sphere of mind, who can estimate the measure of our obstinate endurance? Every man, however, must settle this measure, and the matter too, for himself and by his own mind. No other man can do it for him, *fairly*, *justi-ly*. Let none of us, therefore, shrivel ourselves into an inability, an incapability, as any valid argument for our irresponsibility.

Consider now the prefixed etymon of our word, μετὰ. And here at the outset I venture to deny that, in St. Luke's and St. Paul's writings (which I can best answer for critically), this word ever plainly and directly means *change*, as when μετανοια is translated '*change* of mind,' or anything like it. This, again, is just another instance of jumping at a conclusion, because it may be an object espied at the end of a vista. When, therefore, we pray, in the words of our Collect, that "God would give us true *repentance*," although we know or believe what is quite religiously meant, it betrays an *impatience* which is not religious as is thought. If *-pentance* = -νοία, it were more religious to pray that God would give us honesty of mind; given or granted this by God, *-pentance* or '*penance*' of some sort will inevitably ensue. It is to *ourselves* we are unfair and unjust, as well as to God that *created* us, and "Law" which sustains us, when we ask for '*change of mind*'; it were just as fair, as reasonable, to ask for *change* of hair from white to black, or for change of stature as to measure.

The great burden of the Prophets is man's *dishonesty*, *untruth* to himself. That which St. Paul, too, at Rom. i. 18, speaks of as the "revelation," not of "the Gospel," which

ver. 17 describes, but as of "the Law," of *privilege*, that is, quoting Habakkuk. And he writes "for revealed, or developed, is Mighty Wrath from heaven upon all rudeness and unrightiness of men that are suppressing, holding down, in unrightiness, the truth," that is, what is unconcealed and patent. It is this constant practice, or of *subterfuge*, which even Adam betrayed about Eve, but which is essentially *dishonesty*, which is so repugnant to Right.

I hope I have thus paved the way probably for the defence of my proposition, that μετὰ *ought not* to mean 'change;' for if it be taken so to do, we relinquish the last remnant of Paradise which still *belongs* to us — "hope" (Rom. viii. 24; Gr.), and may lie down in *despair*. Comp., too, Heb. vii. 19, "For nothing did the Law [*i. e., of privilege*] perfect or *finish* [*because it was privilege*], but it was an introduction of a *better* HOPE" *than strict "Law" afforded.* "Law," as Rom. viii. 19, argues, did *suggest* a hope, nay, "*the* hope of being saved;" but "the Law," coming thereupon, "brought in a *better hope*" still.

Again, I venture to deny, as above, that μετὰ ever plainly and directly means *after*. This sense really does *properly* belong to σὺν, as link follows *after* link together to form *a chain*. But μετὰ does not apply to *a chain* of things, but rather to a '*corpus*,' where, to use familiar words, "none is before or after other," though one may be "greater or less than another." The fine argument, from the natural figure which St. Paul employs, quite expresses the force of the idea, 1 Cor. xii. 12–26. Accordingly, the high idea which belongs to τάξις, or "order" and arrangement, is expressed in N. T. from the Gospels onward by ἀκολουθεῖν, *to follow*. Whatever may have grown up upon colloquial or slip-shod Greek will not hold good properly, I am persuaded, in N. T. Greek; so much so am I persuaded, and so grand do

I deem the Greek, that even if classical Greek seem so to do, it may be suspected that our slip-shod interpretation, instead of rigid translation of it, demands a revision.

On this ground I am fain to conceive that we have mistranslated even Ovid's idea of *metamorphosis*. We have most certainly come to use the word *metaphysics* in another sense. And, in short, I suspect that we may have injured Ovid and the classics; that we know really very little about what they intended; and that this has quite logically followed upon the natural habit of jumping to conclusions. Yet we will not resort to the classics to interpret St. Paul's words μετανοια, μετεμελεια,, μεταμορφωσις, μεταςχημα, &c., any more than we will bind ourselves to Rabbinical, to read Biblical Hebrew.

I instance two passages of μετὰ, cum. accus. Luke i. 24, E.V. "*after* those days," though the last clause of ver. 23 suggests another interpretation. Again, xxii. 20: — an important connexion which, though reserved for another Paper, is adduced as a study, "*after* supper;" where the whole force of *so*-consummating History demands another interpretation.

As to the real force of the word, see Liddell and Scott's admirable remarks under μετὰ and μεσος. Yet I venture to qualify their excellent definition of μετὰ, which is thus given: — 'Radic. signif. *in the middle;*' as indeed are their own excellent meanings assigned. Indeed, the no less than VIII. variations of meaning assigned to μετὰ *in composition*, abundantly suggest some indefinableness in its meaning; its power to command or govern three different 'cases' of its noun does the same. Shape this last proposition otherwise; the *case* of the noun being such as it is, and the proposition given, their relation is to be *inferred* without force.

In all the excellent meanings assigned by L. and S.

to the different *cases*, there is a manifest inclination to the etymological synonym *middle;* though with the dative, the idea of *association* is the more prominent, *i. e.*, '*in company with*'; while with the accus. we have '*right into the middle of.*'

It is remarkable how such varied powers as are assigned to it in composition are gathered, and conferred by it. There seems to be thus suggested that some other sense is a-wanting, if it is to afford all.

Now, although it is not pretended that such sense is forthcoming, yet I would suggest that it is the true occupant of the *mean*, not 'middle,' between ὑπερ and ὑπὸ, prepositions of equally or similarly variable application. True, παρα might seem the sense, but its force is *linear* as to space; so perhaps are πρὸ and πρὸς and περὶ, and ἀπὸ. But the above three, with ἐξ are rather *voluminar*, if the word be tolerable, having relation to *volume* which has not *ends*. Then I see *among, amidst* (not 'between,') reducible to what we term the '*mean*' of things analytically, the '*main*' synthetically. This is what we intend by '*mean* values;' and by '*main* force.' If I mistake not, it refers to the difference between ὅλος, and πᾶς; and between ἕτερος and ἄλλος.

It is curious, again, that as we suspected a pronominal basis in νο-, so we may here. For μετα looks not only in its initial as if identical with the objective of the first personal pronoun; but the whole *happens* to be identical with the Ang-Sax. dual of the same pronoun; more plainly still as μεθ'. There would be nothing strange in this if it were so, for it is exactly in accord with the spirit of a common Hebraism; not indeed with the letter of it, for usually the very selfsame word is repeated, and not a different with a similar meaning.

If then we accept *middle, mid-* as a prefix, as comprising the sense of '*both mean and main,*' and, according to the *point du départ, the one or the other*, we may adopt *mid-* as

the syn- of μετα. We thus acquire *mid-thought*. But it behoves us to remember that, "mind" being vast and 'a man' minute, the *mean* of 'mind' may be the entire *main* of 'a man,' so far as his *consciousness* can measure it, or his '*consent*' ["conscience"] appreciate it. I thus collate these terms designedly; for, properly, it is rather "mind" which appreciates, and *sense* which measures; but such *congerialisation* is natural. On these conditions then we may adopt '*mid-thought*,' as a *quasi* synonyme for μετανοία, or "repentance" of E. V.

But there is still another premiss to be borne in mind, which doubtless a Greek philosopher and grammarian would feel; viz., that we traced νο- to the *middle voice* of a verb. That this is of high import we may infer from the words λογος, νομος, πονος, and others. Scrupulously as we are trying to extract the force of our word, it is peculiarly important.

It is usual to regard this as a *reflex* force, and accordingly we supply an objective. But take τυπτομαι, midd. voice; and suppose there be *no objective* to be supplied; then we suppose *myself*. Thus, '*I am beating myself*,' as the Flagellants, and 'doers of penance,' think right to do. All very well does this comport with 'transitive' verbs; but how about 'intransitives,' such as we may be dealing with in νοεω? Even with respect to the former '*I am beating*,' though it be but "*the air*," satisfies the requirements of the middle voice; but νοέω requires 'I am *a-thinking*,' '*a-minding*?' for νο- alone means '*a-thinking*,' '*a-minding*.'

This, holding good then,—although it facilitates the notion of *change* when μετα, *mid-* is prefixed, but we should get astray by so doing—we have *mean*-a-thinking, or *main*-a-thinking, as a better synonyme. Suppose then we adopt the old English substitute for this very formula, and read '*mean-be-thinking, main-be-thinking;*' or, again, as a verb,

I thoroughly bethought myself, or, instead of *thoroughly, I more or less bethought myself*, or '*was a-be-thinking myself*; very common as a provincialiasm recently, if not now. *This* is the idea. To shape it into a noun, '*thoroughly a-be-thinking of one's self*, = μετανοια.

If this *act* be genuine, a *facture*, sure to ensue *by the natural law of our continuance in being*, is the Bible argument, and the Jews' presumption when legitimatized *extra-privilegium*. But,—a *facture?* Is this really the word? Is this really the thing? Here is an instance of the mischief of the terminal *-t-ure;* so with the word '*nature*,' which I must here use. These words *nature* and *facture* are equally *jumps at* the future. "*Law*" has no right to them; *privilege*, = "the Law," has not just right to them. It certainly is desperately hard and trying to so keep one's self, or to be kept, down as to "walk *by belief*, and *not by sense*." Yet this is *the rule*. All that "Law" can fairly predicate or 'promise' is that if an 'act,' then a '*fact*.' The translation of act into fact *is* certain; the interpretation of *fact* into *facture* or the future, even of next moment of time, is indeed predicable, and ever a 'predicate;' but no more. Whatever is "*ex-spected*" more is beyond the bound of "*belief*," which proximately is Law's vicegerent and our security.

The attempt has been to shew, by printing *Facultas, Faculty*, for "mind," that *faculty* may express the character of μετανοία or '*thorough-thinking*. As μετανοησις, which is analogous to συνειδησις, *consent*, or *consentience, or consciousness*, or "*conscience*," which is commonly termed a *faculty*, there would be no difficulty; while with our form of the word there may be difficulty in admitting it. Of course any other term than faculty will serve the purpose if more acceptable; but that a distinct *principle* is intended may be inferred, I think, not only from the value technically grafted upon the word "repentance," but from the exactly corresponding

word διανοία being so employed. Another, however, ἀνοία, *seems* to forbid; but it is only in seeming; for *thoughtlessness, unthinkingness, un-be-thinkingness*, would be synonymous nearly, if not quite.

That διανοια is such seems plainly implied in the passage from Eph. iv. before quoted; where the participle ἐσκοτωμένοι has a causal force. "The nations or gentiles being darkened τῇ διανοίᾳ, do walk in fatuity of their *mind*," νοός. It is thus, hard to conceive of this—"*the* διανοία, otherwise than as a faculty; for it will not do to read διά; as if a modification of δίς, that is *two-fold* bethinking, though it may be a *divided-thinking*. But from examination of the Heb. of some passages, and the LXX. rendering by διανοια, and E. V. "*imagination*," it seems probable that it intends the *faculty* of the "Imagination," [p. .] This is taken up hereafter in a connexion which suggests the enquiry.

If this be admissible in any wise, then we may suppose that some analogue would be appropriate as a faculty for this μετανοία or '*thorough a-be-thinking*,' say *thorough thoughtfulness*. We have already referred to the passages from the book of Proverbs; and we find that, not *reflection* is the idea, but '*meditation*,' '*consideration*,' as it were, *thorough attention*, or rather *the influence of such*. At any rate some *natural* faculty producing a *natural*, but genuine, honest, *whole* influence. I do not say that such *influence* is *native* though *natural*; but I do urge the idea that the faculty is at least as *native* as well as natural, as are sight, taste, &c., in the sensuous organisms. So it be *thorough*, according to a man's measure, differences in *degree* of attainment do not argue differences of *kind*.

I urge this consideration so much the more because, as suggested at the outset, we are apt, most apt, at jumping over "*trying*" delays, which we everywhere read in Scripture is *the* discipline best suited to our best purpose. And may

it not be from the want of this thoroughly exhaustive, or at least depletory *experience actual*, and from an insidious presumption on the *factual*, that we have lately such strange essays about the worth and efficacy of *Prayer*?

I leave the simple thought for the moment to those more competent than I to examine it, although I resume it. But I do also subjoin a caution even to them, that they should not disparage '*Human Nature*.' Truly, the more infantine and helpless it is, as a babe to its parent; the more incompetent it is, as "woman without man, or man without woman;" the truer it is to its real capacity: but we must not therefore disparage its vast capability, by growth in the one metaphor, by marriage in the other. It is, I am persuaded, this extravagance in this one direction which is verily mischievous to the persons themselves who thus pursue it; as is a like extravagance in the other direction—that of prelatic pretension, or as it can be such, to the community. 'Human Nature' "can do no good thing without Thee," that is, God; of course it cannot, any more than "we eat or drink or do anything whatever" without Him; though so continually we do all without adding our contribution therefor "to His glory," that is, to our even 'thinking' of Him. But is it really *not* "*we*" who do so "eat and drink," &c.? or, are these *not* "good things?"

Section 4.

This seems a suitable place for a discursion on this one of our principal topics. We may illustrate this point then by the very difficulties of Language.

When we speak of 'Human Nature,' even accepting the word *nature* in the ordinary sense as = φυσις, is it equivalent to say '*Humanity*,' or a 'man'? Suppose it be, are we any the wiser as to *what it is*? Must we not say with the Psalmist, "What is man—or the son of man"——?

as though quite indescribable? If then we cannot tell what man is, is it not indeed quite "fatuous" to pretend to say what it can *do*, or what it cannot *do*?

Try to handle the first personal pronoun *I*. What am I? Some will think it amply explained by replying—*my self*. Why this very reply implies a *duality*. For this is not equivalent to the Psalmist's questions. To be so, we must say, 'What *is* I?' or, even 'objectively,' 'What *is* me?' Put it 'possessively,' 'What *is* my, = of me?' This must be Possessor; then what is the possession—*Self*,—*a Self!* Therefore I, the possessor = *my*, is "*other*" than the *self* which is possessed by *I* or *me*.

When we put the question, as 'What am I? we talk of a *living* personality. Or 'What *do* I?' we talk of a *moving* personality. But what *is* I? means even less than 'What *be* I?' To be even understood in the matter of mere *being* we must define *I* as *it*;—say *It*, if you please, what then? Still *It* is not It's *self*. If it be true that *I* can do no good thing, it by no means follows therefore that I's *self* cannot. Again, if I am not self, and self's I is not I, but that either repudiates and disowns the other, or is divorced from the other, or is even casually and legitimately and naturally separate from the other, we have in the latter case the counterpart of Gen. iii.; but not so if they were married as 'man and wife,' when the '*possessive* case' is introduced thereby. And if this chapter be, as I believe it is, proto-typical as *double duals*, or *two duals*, and not of the *quadruple* which marriage introduces, we may read somewhat of the declension from *duality* to *duplicity*, that is, from *right* to *wrong*, in the history in that chapter. Less than that will afford not a glimmer of 'What man is?' Nothing short of '*experience* teaches' a simple truth. Now experience means *trial*.

"*Trial!*" Each Apostle who has left an Epistle dilates

on this one theme; but somehow or other we who read them are not at one about *it*, nor about what they would drive us to, or draw us. We have come to deem "Religion" as actively *antagonistic* to "Nature," or *vice-versa*. That there is error here may I think be made to appear plain. Our great passage of course is Rom. vii.

Now because the Apostle consummates his induction by the word ἀντιστρατευομενον, rendered in E. V. most unhappily "*warring against*," the idea of *antagonism* so originates. This is wrong; this is no fair and true description of the actual constituency of *man* as a "creation," κτισις, but of the *denouement*, or *developement* of a man. We noted at the outset about what E. V. calls "*soldiers*" coming to John; that though *provisional* "soldiers," and therefore '*on duty*,' '*on guard*,' they are not active "soldiers" until required so to be from any '*stir*' which may ensue in the community. "Soldiers" are for *foreign work*, not for *home work*, unless from some casual 'riot' through misunderstanding; and even then, they are rather a '*police*.'

Observe now that chap. vii. leads on to that wonderful chap. viii. of this great Epistle. But collate Acts xix. 21–41; and xxi. 31 *et seq.* as to illustration, in part, of the way in which Paul learned experience.

It is very common with many very good Christian people, whose experience possibly may have magnified their observation of occurrences on the way, to state that this chap. vii. describes 'what Paul was in his natural state.' Now in very *terms* here is a great jumble; a very 'muddle of a meddling.' But, at once consider, was Paul ever *un-natural?* When, in his perhaps last Epistle, he writes, "not as though I had attained, either were already *finished off*," was he *un-natural?* Was a Paul untrue, unfair! Much rather is it we who do not go down deep enough into things to experience what he starts his arguments from. 'What Paul *was!*' 'Who then is

Paul?' or *who too is* Apollos? "otherwise than διάκονοι, *Instrumentals*, through, or *by*, which, or *whom*, ye believed?"

What is '*natural*'? what is '*natura*'? It stands, as *natura*, as the synonyme for the Greek φυσις,—a grand word with Paul. At Rom. ii. it is the very pivot of his argument there; and notwithstanding Bishop Butler's 'Three [grand] Sermons on Human Nature,' where I am sure he had more than a mere glimmer of our *thesis*, we have missed the *theme* even generally, and much more particularly.

When St. Paul elsewhere says of himself—"but by the grace of God I am what ["*that*"] I am," our minds have been so trained that we instantly fly off into the *indefinite*, and dignify it by calling it the *infinite*. This is absurd; for we are none the wiser thereby, if our wisdom is to be *testimonied* by our "walk and conversation." At the best we have but got into the *non-natural*, if not the *un-natural*. How then can we judge? When he said that, prefacing the affirmation by a "*but*," it was in contrast with the Judaizers, even the three "seeming pillars" of Ritual and Ceremonial and Formal, even the Apostles who "WERE in Christ before me," and who therefore ought to have *known* something about the matter. His argument, at Gal. ii., with these three "seeming pillars," implies most plainly that if they even had *known*, they had then *forgotten* it, somehow, and had slided off the Rock which originated in them *solid being*. How then can *we* venture to 'dogmatise'?

I well know that all this which *I mean* here will be allowed not only generally but particularly, for we think, that is, we opine, that it is all familiar to the religious man. But this is just the query, whether, *familiar* as it may be, we do know what it *means*?

I above called φυσις the *pivot* of his argument *in that chap.* ii.; that is, of that *particular* argument; but it is not the pivot of his *general* argument, for that is πιστις, "*belief*."

The *general* however is made up of *particulars;* and by a perfect analogy herewith, he suggests, and even implicitly uses the suggestion, that *that general* is NECESSARILY but *a particular of a higher generalisation.*

From this *higher* generalisation, he selects plainly two special *particulars*, which, in our lower estate (not *lowered* estate *yet* — Gen. iii. 22–24) are equivalent to *generals* relatively; but not yet so absolutely. These two (there may be more which do not occur to me at this moment) are νομος (not ὁ νομος) and φυσις, "LAW," and "NATURE." And these are *the two* which St. Paul makes use of in this great passage at Rom. ii. 13–16. I do not mean to translate here this passage because it would involve me in no end of justifications.

I will simply render two clauses; though notice ἀκροαταὶ and ποιηταὶ for comparison with ϛρατιωταὶ, as distinct from ϛρατευομενοι. First, ver. 14; "nations, or Gentiles, which scarcely [μὴ] Law possessing by nature things [τὰ] of THE Law do, these *people* Law scarcely [μὴ] possessing *to*, or *by*, themselves are Law, whosoever *of them*," &c.

Now we must do away with the commas of E. V., just as we do well to read the Hebrew text *without* as well as *with* 'the points'; for in both cases they are interpretative, not merely and truly translative. Neither of these trammels leaves a man free to "be fully persuaded in his own mind." Second; ver. 15, immediately annexed to the preceding, turns a good deal on that compound pronoun which I left off with, "*whosoever*" *of them*. The change of *gender* from the εθνη, or *barbarian no-bodies*, as they were deemed, to οὗτοι and οἵτινες (Lachm. οἱ τοιοῦτοι), or "these" *persons*, is highly significant; and it is precisely these to whom this "whosoever of them" refers. Are *we* justifiable in so copying and imitating the far worse barbarism of Judaism and '*Paganism*' (as it is the fashion still to call it) as to say that the said "Gentiles," τὰ μὴ νόμον

ἐχοντα φύσει τὰ τ. ν. ποιῶσιν, actually being thus ποιηταὶ; are essentially, naturally, different from the "these" *persons* whom he goes on to treat of? Intolerable!

The force, scope, reach of φυσει here, "*by nature*," is plainly '*fore and aft*'; it amounts to this suggestion, intimated in ver. 1 of this chapter by ὁ κρίνων, utterly marred in E. V. into "*that judgest;*" whereas the whole application of the force is in the *participial* form. It is "thou—*the judging one*," *q. d.* "thou, *Man!*" Just as in one of the Psalms we well render, "IN THE KEEPING of Thy commands there is great reward;" only *not* "command*ments*." Here, then, the subjunctive or conditional mood of ποιῶσιν comporting with ὅταν, introduces a possibility—"*when haply—they do do;*" a supposition which is quite unwelcome to *the Jew* at any rate. And yet, says the argument, after seeing the Naamans, the Corneliuses, the Zaccheuses, and hosts of others like the 7000 reserves besides Elias, *such is the fact;* and nothing but prejudice, or a conceit, and a "*will not*," disputes it.

So, then, goes on our Second Clause; this must be so "*by nature*," in "*such as*, or whosoever, are indicating *in this way evidentially*, "the work or operation of THE LAW"; *which work, therefore, must be* "*probably* written, γραπτὸν, in their hearts, 'co-testimonying with these' *said hearts*, the *general* 'conscience,' *consentience, consent*, also, amongst the dialogisms *pro* and *con*" *about right and wrong.*

Don't let the reader hastily discard these interpretative 'points' of mine, any more than the so rigid translation. It is to be noted that the whole proposition is advanced from the "scarcely," the *possible*, to the indisputably *probable* by the grammatical form γραπτὸν; because, not only does its *radical* or *staminal* formation signify a veritable, or at least supposable *fact*, but its 'case' agreeing, not with the word "*the Law*,' but with "the Law's *work* or *operation*," predicates an *act* as the cause of such *fact.* Granted, that "*the Law*" is

the *agent*, who is the *actor?* Or, *vice versâ*, "the Law" is *actor*, and man *agent?* Must it not be by a higher or a deeper "Law" that man is *either?*

Now that "*scarcely*," the *possible*, is to this day not only doubtful, but whatever of credibility attaches to it is explained away. And that *barely* "*probable*,"—that "Law" should "by nature," propagate "things of *the* Law" *in any man*, is far too levelling to be acceptable! "Nevertheless," as the Apostle introduces his illustration of this argument at iii. 31, though we have so nearly "left Law nought to do," *as it were*, "through" the claims "of the *belief*," "nevertheless, Law ἱςῶμεν." The various readings of this verb show that this has long been a *knotty* morsel. Lachm., Tisch., and the 'first hand' of *Cod. Sinait.*, all read ἱςάνομεν, and thus, with E. V. would read, "we *establish*," or *state*. My *argument* would gladly embrace this latter reading, but I do not think it is yet ready for it; nor, I think, is St. Paul's here.

The Apostle's 'enthusiasm,' at ver. 9, excited even him! "What then? Are we over-reaching," by such argument so as to clutch the Gentiles? "Not altogether" *so*. But he is thus *hurried on* into ver. 21–26, and avows he has been so by our ver. 31, if we read ἱςῶμεν; wherefore he adduces the history of Abraham. This would have been unnecessary to a Jew, if the terms of his great Affirmative Postulate were congruous to the Jew, as it must be to a Christian. But, besides that the disputation is with *a Jew*, and not with a Christian, the form ἱςανω is a "rare and *a late* one." May we call it *clerical, ecclesiastical?* But I repeat, the argument is *not ready;* and arguments were out of place for arbitrary decision. I consider that the same objection is suitable for ix. 15–23, though it is thought of otherwise by many. It may facilitate this conclusion, if we suggest an apparent *order* in the arrangements of the Epistle. It opens with φυσις and *Law*; proceeds to *Privilege* and "the Law";

and recurs to φυσις and an *arrest*, or *quasi* SUSPENSE, OF LAW," analogous to the soon *extinct Privilege*.

I conceive then that ἰςῶμιν is what St. Paul wrote; that is, "nevertheless Law we *would, could, should, may* or *can* state;" and therefore he *advances by retrogression* to Abraham, the Jew's axiom.

And where does this land us ultimately? *Not at* "Abraham," but at "Abram"—*the natural*. Gen. xii. opens most abruptly, though not in the Hebrew so abruptly as to require the "*had* said" of E. V. Still it is so much so as to suggest a perfect analogy, or 'harmony by contrast,' with Heb. vii. There the "fatherless, motherless, un-pedigreedable Melchisedec" that nobody knows anything about by "the Law," was evidently Somebody *by* "*Law*." On the other hand, we have the full pedigree, *in* "*the Law*," of "Abram" before he became *privileged* "Abraham;" but no evidence, nor even hint, why "Abram" was thus privileged, any more than why Noah or "Adam" were. The Apostle indeed *ferrets* out a reason, expatiates on it every where, and illustrates it voluminously at Heb. xi.

What is this reason? Observe, it is almost always discovered in *younger* sons, in the "EVE"-s of men, not in the "*Adams*." A vast field for Thought opens up here! Imagine one resultant; that it is not *Man*, but a "son of the man," a man's *Self*, not *the man*, which is likely to be the favourite with a sound and normal Man.

But I halt here; and repeat—What is this reason? "*Belief*." Now as St. Paul, no less vividly, if not even more so than St. James, argues, "*belief working*" is alone deserving the *name* of "*belief*"; but it is not requisite, except for critics and judges, that the "works" be very projectile, as St. James would have them. The "*look*" of "*belief*" is often more convincing and affectionate than a thousand "words and

works." Compare the compound ὀλιγοπιστος.* Witness the poor "cripple's" *look*, which Paul *espied* through and through *the man;* Acts xiv. 9. Was not this poor cripple's *look* of "*belief*" more imploring, affecting, to affectionate Paul, than his very condition of body? But, was it more, or other, than *perfectly 'natural';* only enhanced in degree because this general expectation was all *astir*, and stirred him among the rest? It was not altered in *kind*, only in *degree*, as it were "out of belief into belief"; not a continuous *chain of beliefs*, but *heaps of belief*. And the *naturalness* of this is disputed!

I ask, then, finally, 'What in the world,'—aye, and what *out of* the world, do we mean by '*natural*,' and '*nature*'? We soar too high, as Moses and Paul tell us, Rom. x. 8; we do not go down deep enough into the ἐντος or "*inmost*" of our very entrails and "bowels." Do not fear to go with me, Reader, into this profound; I will not forget the great truth that "by the grace of God I am THAT I am"; but neither would I have you overlook that it is of "*grant*" that your "hair is white or black," which "grant" was once a "grace"; "the *gift*, or *dower*, in grace" ought not to obliterate "the *grace*" of which "the grant" is "the *memorial* of abundant goodness." The affluence of illustration is quite intoxicating; "the road is *not wide enough.*"

"The natural!' 'Nature!' Must we go to the stars to find it? We must find it before we get there, or we never shall!

'Nature' can only be *known* by us in its *course*, '*cursus*'; which is a very *gallop*, co-equal with the '*flight* of Time.' The very word φυσις, when, as I, confidently as analogy can

* I must add, as a note, that these words are *altered* from "faith" to "*belief*" while going through the press, as *required* (in the writer's estimation) by a later section. The Apostle may well collate it with "*hope*" rather than with "assurance," as "*faith*" might be.

make me, refer it to an '*aorist*' item, and *not to a Future*, is quite enough to anybody who knows what the Greek '*aorist*' intends. But the majority among us do not.

"Nature," then — '*natura*' pretends to tell *the future passive;* but we do not choose to have it '*passive.*' Yet, *contra,* St. James argues the folly of our planning what we will do "*on the morrow.*"

But '*passive,*' too, has a force of *the past* in it; this is *too little,* as the former was *too much;* for "as the tree falls so *it lies.*"

Φύσις, then, *Nation,* not even *a* 'nation,' is, what it *is not* before or after any given 'moment,' position, 'situation.' It is ever 'on the wing.' Aye, aye? Query? Who is judge *for another*? For *we* are *pre-t-ending* in spite of ourselves if *we* judge. It is not necessarily 'nature,' or nations that gallop except as we are in the coach; it is *we* that gallop, and nations and 'nature,' for aught we can tell, may be stationary. It is *we,* who ought to be 'Priests' of the 'position,' that "are not suffered to stay by reason of death" and our own impatience. What made Job talk of the "sweet influences" of the Pleiades, Arcturus, Orion? What made Jacob talk about "the blessings of the everlasting hills"? What made David sing "like as the mountains are round about Jerusalem, so," &c.? What means all this? And is not every day, day by day, "the morning spread upon the mountains"? Yes, indeed! And it is this very exuberance of nature which intoxicates us into "wide gates." But we really cannot *carry corn.* "The camel" must "go," or *try to go,* "through the eye of the needle"; whether this be literal, or some 'Temple Bar' out of the Strand into Fleet Street, or out of Fleet Street into the Strand; — who presumes to say which?

This comparison reminds me (there may be some who will excuse for old acquaintance' sake) of my often rowing

through *old* London Bridge. It was an awful business, needing eyes before and behind, and skill and courage and coolness within; I remember on one occasion sitting in the stern while two acquaintances rowed (I had not a tiller), and they managed to get the peak (of the *wherry*) among the Bridge-timbers! The wherry was obliged to swing round, and go out stern foremost, and a big lumbering coal barge was close upon us, and we all-but got through together! Oh, that *swing!* The *moment of time* was everything to us! I sat still; and my friends afterwards expressed their remembrance of my wonderful coolness and courage. I now well remember that *I had not seen the barge* which would have smashed our wherry. Unless one remembers the rush of water through the old Bridge, he will not see the force of the comparison.

Now suppose the tide running out; I do not think that a row back through old London Bridge from a Greenwich white-bait dinner to town, would, or does, *fairly* represent what is expected of us to "gain eternal life," by Him who made both us and the tides. This is why I said about the "camel" and "the needle's eye," *or try to go;* all that is wanted is to try, try, try, until we learn *the nature of things.*

But why is it, then, that we cannot *take things for granted?* The Priest tries hard — the whole conclave of Cardinals, and Pope to boot, try hard — but we abide Galileos still. It strikes me that there is in this stubborn fact a truth far more profound than that we should be converted by the merely sensuous. A truth in fact, and "by *Law,*" more indelible and obstinate than ought to be left at all hazy.

"Nature," '*Nation,*' then, from our cleverest point and power of vision, is a '*cursus,*' a *course,* like as is Time. Did you ever try to get hold of an hour, a minute, a second?

When you have succeeded, try the same upon your *self*, your's *Elf*.

I leave the thesis, however, for mightier hands and heads. There is something which must be overlooked, I am sure, as was said towards the outset, which "the analogy of the BELIEF" requires, when '*Human* Nature' is so decried. For instance: that while "spiritual *things* are dis-cerned by spirituals," so can '*natural*' things be *naturally* estimated by '*naturals*' only. I am bold to say that as little is *known* of the latter as of the former by any man either outside or inside of a man's own self, much less of another's self; for no man has yet contrived to "*have emptied himself*," and yet survive as the man. We read in Genesis that even God threw Adam *into* "*ecstacy*" to take the "rib" out of him!

Section 5.

As we have, perhaps not unwarrantably, hit upon the faculty of *Imagination*, that divider, distracter of *the mind*, as a probable equivalent for διανοία, there is suggested something equally natural and analogous for μετανοία.

There is, in the 'second series' of the '*Essays of Elia*,' one entitled—'*Barrenness of the Imaginative Faculty in the Productions of Modern Art*,' which may be thus skimmed of its illustration. The writer (Charles Lamb?) says, "We have before us a fine rough print, from a picture by Raphael in the Vatican. It is the Presentation of the new-born Eve to Adam by the Almighty." The point singled out by the writer is 'the situation,' as he thinks Raphael has done. He then offers probable ways of a modern artist's interpretation of it; but, in contrast, he says, thus, "has Raphael expounded the situation of Adam. Singly upon his brow sits the absorbing sense of Wonder at the creative miracle. The *moment* is seized — a moment how abstracted!"

Exceptions may be taken to this by many minds; but

none, I think, at the grand and child-like idea of Wonder. Perhaps, however, had it been at the created, rather than the 'creative miracle,' it had been a more truthfully *natural* interpretation of Raphael's thought about the 'situation' and the 'moment.' Here Adam is, we suppose, in his pristine innocence, and the wonder is most suitable and natural; but, surely, at Eve. For the 'creative miracle' was entirely out of his ken, the created expressly within his ken.

If the 'creative miracle,' however, were the true idea, certainly our thoughts rise to the sublime above the natural. From this point of view, nevertheless, Adam was a comparatively 'old stager'; and if seasons rolled round, and spring was exuberant then as now, his wonder might, perhaps, have been greater at the Doing than at the Deed. Look, however, at Eve, more akin to our own level, perhaps; not exactly as 'new-born,' but a very neophyte, virtually. *Her* wonder certainly would be stupendous, and have reached its *acme* upon Adam. This is not the theme of 'the Essay,' but more suitable here. She, too, was in innocence; but her wonder would differ from Adam's. Adam instantly recognises her as a portion of himself; while, by analogy, Eve must have divined, as it were, a Parent of herself, if not a whole. Her wonder would partake of '*awe*'—ἄγη; not exactly of *fear*, for she was innocent; but of '*awe*.'

Now suppose the innocence of both marred, by a gradual decline together, the mutual natural relations to each being preserved, however deranged. Then Adam takes the place of Eve in the old scale, so to speak; and *fear* in both that of the former *awe* in her. But what of Adam's *pure wonder*? What has become of this?

If we look to the Latin for synonyms, we find *miraculum*, *portentum*, *prodigium*, and as verb transitive, *miror*; but—note the fact! as verb intransitive, *stupeo*, *stupefio*, *obstupesco*, in fact, *to stupefy*. Most lamentably, aye, and wonderfully

at the hand of man, has this Latin idea spread like a pall over the world for so many years, as if *stupidity* could be that "*fear*" which is "beginning of *wisdom!*" And some men would revive it in England, as if we still were so superstitious! If we be, is the fault wholly on one side only?

Now both fear and awe partake largely of the 'sensuous' in our present condition; whereas, as we have tried perhaps tiresomely to shew, John's word implies an appeal to pure, mere, though thorough *mind*. From the other Gospels we infer more plainly than from this that John's preliminary demand was one's '*confession* of sins,' a feeble word to express the Greek, which is constructed of the very root of the word, *Logos;* that is, that black was and is black, and white white; "no lie in our right hand." 'Confession' in this sense, indeed, engenders plenty of *awe* in the delinquent, plenty of the sensuous when he faces "the Kingdom of Heaven," as the other Gospels say was his urging motive; just as the Apostle Paul afterwards, 2 Cor. v. 11, "Sensing, then, the fear of the Lord, we persuade men," not *drive* nor *stupefy* them; and just as with any capital criminal at the bar when the jury returns the verdict of 'guilty.'

But how do we *know, i. e.* become *sensible,* that we are guilty? The Jews under "the Law" well notionally knew, and accordingly "paid tithe of mint, anise, and cummin," "washed the outside of the cup and of the platter," and so forth; and deemed themselves exonerated. But how often would they have failed of even these, and become careless or indifferent about them, if any occasion required! "The law," however, admitted of no excuse from duty; nor any apology but penalty. The Jew, then, would well understand the startling cry of this Herald.

John does not affect any power of 'absolution,' nor does he demand 'confession,' or *homologesis,* of sins to *himself;* enough for him if they come thus acknowledging their need,

and trusting the Prophet and his warning. But all this, and far more than this, fell very far short of what he urged. While his extraordinary appearance, life, "walk and conversation," and behaviour, proved the mystical intent, and depictured, as it were, the "way" he was so "preparing" for One who was on the point of coming after him, that would "baptize" with quite material instruments, and in another way; he would certainly excite a natural *wonder*, which should issue in a far more overwhelming *wonder*. It doubtless grows so vast as to pass by the limits of the natural; and the natural is not relinquished; nor does John pretend to any such feat or power. Call it, if you will, "repentance," or 'change of mind'; yet it is what he utterly disclaims the power of, or authority for, producing. How, then, 'absolve'?

Now hereabouts lies, I feel, both the strength and the weakness of Ritualism, Establishment-ism, and all that sort of thing. And I think I can shew, probably, whence confusion arose, and arises still, viz., inattention to the tenses of the Greek verbs, both in the Vulgate and E. V. Take one chapter alone, Heb. ix., where not only are we put all astray, but the fine illustrative application to this very day is quite missed. The theme, however, is so intimately associated with my Second Part, that I reserve for the present an answer to that *How?*

The *why?* does belong here in a measure, for it was simply a *fact* that somehow John could *pro*-cure 'absolution' of some sort, and *did*, for those who *reciprocated* with him. 'Absolution' of what? "Sins." What kind of "sins"?

A highly artificial state of Jewish society existed, because a highly privileged one. John appears—terrible. This privilege was greatly perverted, both by abuse or disuse, and misuse. Yet to such an extent had custom and fashion pre-

vailed, that the Jews did not know it! John could not but startle "them that were at ease in Zion."

Now this kind of "sins," the non-payment of 'small tithes,' as it were, a kind of 'venial sins,' John, like the Priests, from Aaron downwards, could cancel or discharge, 'absolve.' It was, however, very *generous*, not to think of *gracious*, in him to do that much; for if "they that minister at the altar do live of the altar," how were they to live if the altar were not supplied by *any body*? *This* generosity, then, was virtually the fruit of his own self-denial. He did personally seek for more than a due acknowledgment of this; by-gones are by-gones, and cannot be recalled, nor can compensation to-day cancel the damage of yesterday. But, in an artificial state of things, this is a prodigious truth, a Wonder, to realise. Yet this is simply the true nature of things so related to Privilege. We are apt to forget that there is *nature* in privilege which is Peculiar, and underlying that a *nature* almost indefinite and General. That defection from the Peculiar does not halt at the General, or *par*, but falls below in the measure of the Peculiar; and that restoration is *up from below*, *up to par*, that is, to the General, the Natural.

That depressed, defective state was just that artificial state into which Judaism had lapsed the Jew. It was a wonderful thing to see in him any approach towards the natural. The same argument, *mutatis mutandis*, holds good with us now in this our day; but is the force of it really and truly seen? A portion of Heb. ix. is given further on, p. 70.

Now in this whole scene with John, man is simply responsive, submissive, as a child exhibits it to the full, and more than full. But, keep to an adult, this whole scene may be transacted within the sphere of pure, mere *mind*, provided *Wonder* is the regnant, and in *its own* thoughts [ἴδια]. It is true, indeed, that we cannot define the reach of *mind*,

because we cannot isolate *mind*; so neither can we tell where the sensuous begins. We are familiar, however, with expressions which imply the difference. We say *buried*, or *lost*, in Thought, but we say *lost*, never *buried*, in Wonder. So neither can we exclude the influence of *Intelligence*, say φρήν, nor of *Imagination*, διανοια? nor of the affections, καρδια, and the *sensuous*, εἰδησις; for all these are equally natural, if not native, Faculties. We do say, however, when we read what John *heralded* by the word μετανοία, that his appeal is to *Mind*, as still sovereign of the General, until subject of the Peculiar and Particular, as of *the whole* 'situation.' And that naturally too, for compliance is *natural deference*. There is not, then, any word so adequate, I believe, to express that *wholeness* of pure mind, as—WONDER.

See the picture which Moses suggests. "When your children ask you in time to come, What mean ye by this service?"—upsetting all our plans and playthings, roking out every hole and corner for leaven, and interrupting all our games—what mean ye, *we wonder?* "Then shall ye say unto them,"—we were "in a great strait," and God sent deliverance by the *hand* of Moses, with the *mouth* of Aaron, and we are going to memorialize them and the event. Clearly the children defer to their parents, parents to the Aarons, Aarons to Moses, Moses to God. *All*, but the last *only*, is perfectly natural; and even *all* the fruit of Wonder. Nomere *thinking* of it could have brought it about, because we cannot, complex as we are, apply a whole and undistracted mind, to it even "at our best estate"; and again, because "man at his best estate is *not* altogether" *only mind*.

Now this *Wonder* is to amount to a very "*Baptism*"; is to endure until the un-natural—the misuses, disuses, abuses, &c., &c., of Privilege are all washed away, that is, until "discharge of sins," such as these ensues. The circum-

stances, the 'situation,' indeed change, but only in so far as we affect them, or rather, our "sins" affected them; no doubt we make the *water* of the Bath very dirty! we make a wondrous mess of the *mind*. *We* make? *We* make! That is just the Q. E. D. of the great problem.

Now it is hereabouts that we disclaim privilege-rights. Enough, and more than enough, to be exonerated from privilege-wrongs. But what is the process? If, in the hands of John, and in his time, it were safe, is it so now? At any rate, can a Priest, with safety to himself or to you, procure it by '*stupefy*ing' you with pomps and threats of this world and the next? Is the Confessional a *safe* one anywhere, but when you "entered into thy closet and shut the door, and ad-ore thy Father in secret"?

The Priest may, indeed, *like any other one of the "one another"* whom St. James tells us to "homologize our sins to" while "*slaves*" of "the law" of inflated Privilege, help us to fancy that we do homologize them,—most dangerous 'conceit' to both parties! Just as we encourage a boy by 'patting him on his back' to go through some great ordeal, so, the ordeal being travestied, our sins may seem hideous as they may be false in fact, and ourselves be more horrible than even the Devil can truthfully 'paint us' "under LAW," except by abuse of "*the* Law." A Priest, writhing himself under the gallings of affronted Privilege, may advise, counsel, as from his own experience, delicious as he persuades himself 'mortification' is, you to persevere and bear it; but he cannot 'absolve' you from them; he cannot release even himself; he can only affect a disgust, to be *bought* of him, which may be a lie; and we in return affect a disgust which we *sell*, which may be another lie. But observe further how the proposition has shifted out of "discharge of sins," into *discharge of us from sins*. You may say they 'come of the same thing'; but will they '*go* to the same thing'? They

do not amount to the same thing; they are several and different propositions.

Now, from what we have seen, even the *practice*, much more "*heralding*," John aimed at was the *stripping the privileged naked*—the washing away all our 'fig-leaves,' the evidences of defection from privilege; and then, there we stand, "a spectacle to angels and to men!" But that is just as we were born, naturally. The priestly office, and our own *shrinking*, or "drawing back," are apt to favour our *sneaking* out of our sins; but then, there *they remain*, wherever *we* go, eternal monuments of unfairness and wrong; and through them we become the Priest's *villeins!*

On the other hand, what does discharge of sins really involve? Somewhat *like* what Gen. ii. says of our first parents—"And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed." How even approaching to be really *like* this? Conversely, how *possible?* By *a likeness* of the contrivance expressed in the clause—"the man and his wife." But this belongs to our Second Part, which deals with exigencies and emergents.

There is a figure throughout Heb. ix., perhaps suited to every age in a way not adequately perceived. In the first place, the "tabernacle," σκηνη, culminating in the Temple, and David and Solomon at Jerusalem, is the great starting point, the *nucleus* of privilege.

The reading of ver. 1 is disputed. Compared with viii. 2, and the arrangement of the words, ix. 1, 2, it would seem that *tabernacle*, and not "*covenant*" (E. V. *Italics*), were the idea to be supplied; but Lachm., Tisch., and *Cod. Sin.*, all omit σκηνὴ there. Therefore begin with—

Ver. 2. For a tabernacle was furnished, the first—which is 'leged' holy.

3. About [?] the second rail, too, a tabernacle, it being leged holy of holies.

4. Having [not "which had"] a golden censer," &c.
6. —into, indeed, the first tabernacle always do enter [not "*went*"] the priests, finishing up, or putting finish upon, the rituals [&c.];
7. but into the second *goes* [not "*went*" —which he proffers [not "proffered"].
8. This *fact* the Holy Ghost signifying, not yet manifested [made apparent], has been the of-the-holies way, yet the first tabernacle
9. having stasis [not "*was* standing]; the which *is* [not "was"] a figure [lit. *parable*] unto the season [*occasion*] that has instanded, *at any time*, according to which season [*occasion*] are proffered [not "*were* proffered"] which cannot [not "*could* not"]—"that did the service," E. V., or "*doing*,
10. —*which stand*, or *consist*, upon meats and drinks, until season [*occasion*] of direction, being *so* imposed [*laid on*]—
11. Christ too—through the better and more finished tabernacle——
12. entered"——

The Vulgate has *some* of these errors of tense; *e. g.*, ver. 1, "*Habuit*," for *Habebat*; ver. 4, "*habens*," for E. V. "*had*"; ver. 6, "*introibant*," for *introeunt*. 8, "*habenta statum*," not as E. V.; "*est*," not as E. V., "*offeruntur*," not as E. V. "*non possunt*," not as E. V.; "*servientem*," not as E. V.; 11, peculiarly its own, but very fine; E. V. missing *the point* altogether.

Now, in these present times there are some who hunt for evidence as to 'the *date* of the Epistle.' Accepting as I do its own intrinsic evidence as to its origin, this thought disappears in one much more interesting to me. I read in these 'presents' the sketches of no less than a

Paul, of things — *occasions*, "*seasons*," &c., which have been long before Moses, with Moses, and ever since. For I read in that one *perf.* and a *participle* as it is, ἐνεστηκοτα, a very compilation of Rom. iii. 25, as to "the *sinments* that are past," present, and to come; because I see in those 'presents' *things that are — occasions*, "*seasons*," &c., and ever will be while man lives and "multiplies" on earth. I can even see in ver. 1, direct reference to Cain and Abel in Gen. iv.; in ver. 2, Cain and Sheth, the mixed natural and privileged; in ver. 3, the privileged extolled.

Again, in ver. 6, the advance upon the mere natural, into Whom the priest — the man himself, "enters always." Who ever had such power or authority "always," as to enter into a man's "closet" "always," "and put a finish upon" his adorations, but the man himself? I conceive in ver. 7 an Aid-Personal, like Rom. viii. 26, 27, which is indeed a very "Husband" to client Humanity.

And I conceive a high "significance of Holy Ghost," hereby, that these occasions and "seasons" will recur so long as "the first tabernacle has *stasis*," as 2 Cor. v. so beautifully explains. We may proffer and Priests may proffer under the Pædagogue; but we shall never get Liberty from "the Law," until we are *natural* "under Law." And here is the weakness of Ritualism and Establishmentism for all above Babies; because they cannot, satisfactorily to *adult consent*, "perfect that which concerneth us," not to name God.

Section 6.

On "Sin."

OF course it is adventurous in me to aim at this theme; but yet I am persuaded that *another man's* venture cannot convince *me* about it. This, I apprehend, is the meaning of the Christian's assertion of the absolutely indispensable preliminary aid of God the Holy Ghost for conviction. I *assent* to this. "I *consent* with it by my mind" thoroughly; but that very limitation "by my *mind*," shews that this is not *consent*. Already we are in the fork of a dilemma, and don't know it. Nay! Are we *in the fork?* Not so, indeed; *that* is THE *desideratum!* There would be, according to *Bible Portraiture*, some "hope" of us, then!

That word, "*consent*," has come to be *a mighty Lie!* When at Rom. vii. 16, in the midst of an argument which careful examination will discover as bringing not only "*will*," but ἐγω, I, along with "*mind*" into our category, E. V. unhappily copies the Vulgate '*consentio*,' and renders "I *consent* unto the law," "*legi*." This is an utter perversion of St. Paul's very language, and, I think, of his meaning.

As to language; his verb is συμφημι, which literally is, '*I con-say*,' the word "*say*" φημι, being the simplest form of *assenting*. The etymology once more sends us back as we thought we saw in νο-, to the first pers. pron.; not however to ἡμεῖς, *we*, but to ημ-ι, the prime radical, which is the prime *half* of the word. It is unquestionably only the veriest modification of εἰμ-ὶ, not, except by implication or involution, of εγω but of με; for εγω = *i* suffix. This is the root or prime stem.

The Sanscrit for *I* is *aham;* the Greek, Latin, and English first pers. sing. of the subst. verb is *am, sum,* εἰμί.

In each of these the *m*, μ, is the *objective* case of *I*, whence, if these be identical, that is, first pers. pron. and the first pers. sing. of the verb, the further suffixed *I* is required to form identity of *person* out of the objective *me*. Hence they are not identical, though so similar; they are not even equal, though so like: — the old story of the '*homoousians*' and '*homoiousians*.' If I say '*am*' in English, it really has no meaning; but in Hebrew עם, λαος, '*a people*,' it has all significance; and yet ages ago was seen the kinship of λαας, λιθος, '*a stone*,' with λαος, '*a people*.' It seems just the difference between *I* and *It*; and that difference is caused by the lapse of the digamma; since both words are λαϝας, λαϝος. But everywhere, as in *tu, vos, thou, you*, this digamma is the second pers. sing. as θ of λιθος, *t*, is of the *third*.

Further; supposing then that ημι = εἰμί = *sum* [?] = '*I am*,' what shall we make of our verb φημι = '*I say*'? If we had arrived at εἶμι = ἴω = '*I go*,' we might have thought the φ of φημι so expressed, as I believe it to be; that is, that along with λεγω, εἶπω, ἔπω, they are all dressings variously of one identical root, or root stem, which is εἰμί = ἔω = '*I be*, or *am*.' This brings up A, B, C, in their turn promissory of D, E, F, and again G, H, I, and again J, K, L, and again M, N, O, and again P, Q, R, and again S, T, U = V or W, or Y through X. This is a wonderful series of triplets which somebody has concocted for our *English* 'alphabet' — *alone* [?]. *Grimm* well admired '*English*.'

If then φημι and εἶμι = ἴω, be but a varied *dress* upon εἰμί = ἔω, they import — *e. g.*, fig-leaf-aproned Adam-and-Eve; not either without the other *naturally*, for they are to be viewed *politically* — OUR sole source of idea of *what is natural* — as one compages; just as a *man and his self* is one compages in every *polity* under the sun. That they should be "warring against" one another because they are

at variance is as unnatural, as if our right and left hands were "warring"; or our *two* eyes which come *at once, at one, for one* image.

I follow φημί. See Liddell and Scott's capital article, which says it '*belongs to* φάω.' Be it so; then we have αω, εω, ιω; but what about οω, υω, and the Sanscrit *llo, llro,* as in λαας, λαος, &c.? At the bottom of all lies undoubtedly the '*personal* pronouns,' first, second, third; perhaps used adverbially, or else as verbals, or even verbs. Here is a vast field. This noble Lexicon says ἠμί is φημι shortened; and if φαω be the root, its meaning may *approach to* '*I show,*' for δ-ειχ-νυμι *is* that. They *approach,* as do our English words *say, see;* ——

Whatever it exactly *means,* it is not enough the exact case of our passage, which has συμφημι. Comp. John ix. 41: — "but now ye LEGE, *Item,* we do SEE, βλ-επο-μεν, &c. Our word is far short of *lege;* it is simply to '*say,*' short of '*assert.*' I do not follow out my *pronominal* theory in all these words; as these few type-specimens may suffice. With the prefix συν-, *con-, co-,* '*with,*' it thus means '*I see,* or *say with* — you'; '*I agree* — to you'; '*agreed!*' '*aye-aye,*' 'say *Yes,*' &c., &c. — *q. d.,* '*for argument's sake,*' I *allow* that, I *grant* that, &c., &c. It does not at all follow that I *believe* the proposition, nor that I *belie* myself; it is a kind of bargain for the '*n-once.*'

And now, what does the Apostle here mean by this verse in this his profound argument with the jealous-for-*the* Law Jew, after his terrible exhibition, along with the exceptional probability, of the Gentile? The Apostle is personating a *Natural,* because *he is natural;* and from *Nature's* standpoint he, as he describes *himself* and *his self* at ver. 14, replies to the Law-y Jew. I read him thus, not as the Vulgate nor E. V., '*Conveho,* or *I concede* to the Law, *Item,* it's well, or *fair and beautiful.* There 's somewhat of "salt"

κ-αλος and "savour" in it. But, mark you! "If that salt have lost its savour, wherewith will you *salt that salt?*" Conversely; for this *natural* and obvious converse he desires to bring out; if "the law" you so idolize have "lost" its genuine *'o-later*, or worshipper, and so its 'occupation 's gone,' it have nought to work upon, no "heart," where we look for the "indication of its work," because "*consent*, or '*conscience*' is bearing joint testimony" with that "*heart-scribble*" to the Law's veritable and active influence—who but a Natural—not a "Fool" necessarily, though better so than un-natural—will look for good, hoping to find good?

I think this the strongest position which the Ritualist can take. But then, he too must be *natural*, and not affect the *non-natural!* If the "salt" retain "savour," and *the man*, perhaps *either* prelate or pauper, be natural, I, too, "concede to the Law, *Item*, well," beautiful, as ever were all the Aarons and Levis that ever ministered. But alter either of these conditions, and I consider that not "even Solomon—a greater than Aaron—in all his glory was arrayed as one of these lilies of the field." To "con-SAY" with or to "the law," then, may be very, very far short of "con-*sent*" with or to the Law. *Does 'either' man 'consent'?*

To analyse properly this wonderful chapter were the work of a life-time. I recur, therefore, to ver. 7, 8, whence this proposition started.

"What then shall we SAY, ἐροῦμεν? Confer ἐρομαι; where shall or will be the proper *topic of enquiry?* What *peg* shall we love or prefer to hang our enquiry upon? What shall be our 'postulate'?—"That the Law is 'Sin'? God forbid!" Observe, it is not dignified with an ὅτι, though I have offered one; because a '*postulate*' so called must be a *datum* also. If it be viewed as a 'question' it must be a '*relative*' as much as an '*interrogative*,' as with our English pronouns. This, then, discarding all 'points,' is the formula—"The Law

'Sin'"; μὴ γενοιτο—"Be it scarcely likely to become so, or come to be so!" Wonderful *Prophecy!* Most prophetic optative! Have we really eyes to see, ears to hear, a right *will,* if we wilfully foreclose Paul's prayer? *Scarcely!* Rather, surely, because "we *lege, Item,* we do blearingly see—"men as trees walking"—οὖν, *ergo, operatively,* our 'Sin' stays," *abides, 'manse'-s,' "houses* in us."

"The Law '*Sin*'"! How could such suspicion befall what is *beautiful?* Let every man answer to himself—not to another—when he sees a 'girl'! It is not without some good reason that St. Paul opens chap. vii. as he does when speaking *at liberty;* nor that Prophets talked about adultery, fornication, and harlotry, when they "spoke" in fetters. Though both might have expatiated on the beauty of a flower, as God has done (Rom. i. 20) on the beauties of the sky, such appeals lack force. Why? Their 'congruity' with man is absent! Very wonderful! And we exaggerate, foster, 'cook' the wonder! Enforced, legitimatized celibacy! Infernal device, because Satan has not "a helpmeet for him"! Damnable conceit, because poor man is divorced from his Maker!—separated from his Lord! God appointed, and arranged; the Devil disarranges, and man disappoints! Wonderful! "*Nature*" is exuberant, nay redolent, in very throes, with her protests and her perfumes!

"The Law 'Sin'!" What, in the very name of wonder, is 'sin'? What is "the Law"?

"The Law," we gather largely "about the Logos" of its meaning. The 'religious' world is full of its "*fame.*" What did it mean? It afforded, and so "was given" to grant us, "*liberty*" to "love" women, and flowers, and fruits, and Al-mack's of God's beautiful world, *if we were but natural.* "The truth" was the only prohibitory to our full enjoyment of them all. Every "spring" Nature is full of exponents of the *Demands* of Nature and the natural;

but a very continuous 'winter of discontent' is provided to most mercifully prevent our yet *fairly* enjoying 'Nature.' A premature summer would only make us idolize them; yet "Liberty" is given *as a privilege* by "the Law," if we choose to transplant ourselves to the hot-house, the forcing house, as "*Eve*" did. I wonder what *Eve* now thinks at the *unnatural*, disarranging, displacing, yet '*sacramental*' order of her daughter *Mary!* Can "the Truth" lie underneath this ordinance even down in its very deepest "*Well*"? "I trow *not*."

But about "the Law," and "Law" — what? Lord Byron, I remember, told us of an ancient idea that the original 'sin' was premature commerce between Adam and Eve. Very likely; a very good explanation of a metaphor. But metaphors don't suit the Bibliolaters now-a-days. Yet, there is great seemliness about the thought, as if that is why we are such a bastardized progeny. For, mind, "Law" was *insistent* before "the Law" was *existent*. "Law entered into US incidentally, by the bye, alongside of events, so that it might amplify the fault" or the fault might amplify; but *this* "Law," though "scarcely being Law," WAS *in being* before that. When arrested or modified as at Gen. iii., and "the Law" of *privilege* was initiated in us *as a law*, even the colleague of "the hope" which sham'd fig-leaf excuse — far more cunning than clever or wise — Law was *persistent* latently. The reign of "the Law," though it superseded, did not abrogate, the Despotism of "Law. We know not much about the differences between satraps, kings, emperors, despots now; but the East was full of them. All is now done away with; and *if we will* "the Law" is done away because "it is finished"!

'*If we will*'! Wonderful again! "*Will*"! Why we thought we had affixed it in the *mind*. It is rightly so,

according to this chapter. Does "the Law" reign in the mind then, or aim to do so? No; but in the affections, and they are so "*seared*" *artificially* as not to deserve so joyous a name. Now "Law" has nothing to do with affections — nor for the matter of affectations except to damn them *instanter* —; "Law" *rather* avoids them, for they are the sub-province of "the Law." Nor does "Law" deal with *mind* alone, though there is the Court of *Sovereignty;* not of *Despotism,* for that would preclude Liberty, and the *Lord's* honour, who is Vicegerent of the "Despot." This title, by the bye, is worth noting; it is thus used: *once* by Luke; *once* by Peter, Acts iv. 24, not again till *once* in each of his Epistles; *once* in Jude; *once* by John in the Apocalypse; *never* by St. Paul in his Epistles to *peoples,* but *thrice* to Timothy and *once* to Titus. To my mind this fact is a volume. Paul would carry us back by his two *youngsters* to Nature; though it is necessary to remind even Timothy *three* times as if *because* circumcised, while *once* suffices for Titus, and one Epistle too.

But about "the Law"; and '*if we will.*' "The Law" means *privilege,* that is *exceptional law* under *Law imperial.* 'Privilege' was *endowment* to the Jew, "above all the nations upon the earth"; and we see the issue *in them* to this day! *Because* a Jew? Not a bit of it. "For the Law, was of or from defaultings gratuitously applied *as a* furniture or appanage, until when have come the seed BY or UPON whom or which, something had been made promissory or angelical; having been distributed, or arranged distributively, in hand of a *Go-Between,* or *Gone-Amidst:*" Gal. iii. 19.

But now all this could not safely be unless "Law" were *persistent.* And "Law" permits these disasters! *Permit!* How can *privilege* exist, or permission *subsist,* safely, unless Law *persist?* Where is the hardship? Nay, where the

favour? Where is the risk? Nay, where *is not* the grandeur!

So then is it still a tenable postulate — "The Law, 'sin'"? It will be to some wonderful lurking principle in man. Thank God; Paul makes it out, as 'Moses did long ago,' that "*Sin*" was and is an alien's work. Still it was "man"; "an *Enemy-Man* hath done this"! Adam said it was Eve or God; Eve said it was "the serpent" and herself — honest woman! Don't let us say it is the Devil and *not we* who thus bring this about. God will match the Devil; but who will match us, since we are in the province of "the Law" and "the Will"? The answer I reserve until better experienced to give it. I am here very desirous to elicit the *natural.*

"The Law" — *a privilege,* 'Sin'! What then, in the name of all that is curious, is 'SIN'? Is it *natural?* VERY! For it is actually implied in the meaning of εὐσεβεία, by every *natural* analogy. "Procreation" — rather *progenition,* according to our notion of Nature as a *cursus* or course, to and fro, that is, were impossible without section, 'sex.' It were objectless, useless, fruitless.

See the Apostle's illustration of εὐσεβεία, that is, '*right noble culture,*' 1 Tim. iii. 16, it matters nought what the Greek be, whether ος or Θς, for the *gender* of either says it is *God* — not 'the *Church,*' or any "*stylus.*" "And continuously homologuing-ly great is the right-noble-culture's mystery; *for instance,* God, *Deity,* was manifested in flesh, was right-wised in spirit, was seen [? ὤφθη, *opticked?*] *by* angels, was heralded in nations, was trusted or faithed or believed in *Cosmos,* was resumed in glory" *in the opinion and* GLOIRE *of those who witnessed.*

This is Paul's illustration of NATURE, by the nature of — not *Things,* but of "*God, Deity*" — the FIRST *Tablet* of "the Law."

Now see St. James's correspondingly beautiful explanation and illustration of the *second table* of "the Law," which is *privilege*. Beforehand, let the reader refer to and study John xiv. 8; and xx. 27. Note again that St. Paul's illustration is drawn of the *grand*, the *sublime;* St. James's is "like unto it," but is drawn from *the 'mean,'* as much as to say with Horace (how came he to learn it?) *in medio tutissimus ibis!* (What did *he mean* by *tu-tu-tu-t*, &c.? or rather, what did the Latin *people once* mean by such a word?) St. James's *word* θρησκεία is not to be usurped by *the officious*. No doubt, long before officialism obtruded itself, there were "*good Samaritans*" among men. The word as connected with θεραπεια, of which there can be little doubt, means, so to speak, a *servitor*, or *a walking basket*, of θερα; "now Terah for was the father of Abram." See Gesenius and Fürst. Thus, then, St. James; "Parentage, or carriage of benefits legal and unfiltered-able, on par with the God and Father, is this; to keep up surveillance upon orphans and widows in their tribulation [*not necessarily at other times so as to wrong or bother and bewilder and mystify them*], spotless himself to serve [*preserve* ?] from the world."

This is one summit of *privilege*, "the law," and a sublime one. But whence came the privilege? What prompts the privileged? "Law," and "Nature," or *the natural*. "If, too, any one is not forethinking of his own *affairs*, and especially of householders, of householdings, the faith or belief he were denying, and than one untrustworthy is worse." If we ask, "And who is my neighbour?" St. Paul might reply, "And what are your own *belongings*, what *the dimensions of* the house, *having doors and windows?*"

It really is very unaccountable that men should dream of discrepancy in the Epistles of these two Apostles. The two tables of "the law" hung together very well; our two hands, or our two feet, work together or alternately

very well; our two eyes and two ears actually blend their occupations respectively; what must such men be?

Now it is this province in which lies the exercise of the Ritualist. It is very clever, expert; *kindness* ought to melt man. It is akin to that "more excellent way" that St. Paul "shews."

Well, well; but *Nature* is quite as keen in the intended beneficiary as in the would-be benefactor. Nay more, *Nature* is very "jealous," as is Nature's God. Healthy nature in man, and the man cannot 'stand *humbug*'; she is proud, handsomely proud, when accepting a boon. "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind!"

Again, then, the postulate is, "The Law-'SIN.'" What then is "*Sin*"? We have seen what *the* privilege intended by "the Law" is; and we are taught, and believe, that now "it is finished." But is "SIN"? I reply, is Nature? Is "Law"? Not a whit, either; and '*Sin*' now is only more insidious, less glaring and *bloody*, than "the Law" shewed it.

What is "*Sin*"? So far as I can comprehend Dr. Müller's great work on "The New Testament Doctrine of Sin," it seems resolved into *selfishness*. I do not think this adequate; because, though God Himself "created Evil," as He says in Isaiah, and says St. Paul, Christ "not having known SIN over and above ours, did, made, or created SIN"; and yet not a shadow or a vestige of *selfishness* was seen by man in Him. It is indeed true that Heb. xii. 2, by its ἀντὶ may be perverted into this idea; but then, the figure of our *two hands and arms* is neglected, though furnished by *man*, "created in the image and likeness of God." If it were, as it is, resolvable into any thing like that, yet the last clause of the verse above quoted from 2 Cor. v. offers explanation which *enwraps us*, so that *we* ought to be dumb on such a train of thought. But, indeed, Heb. i. 4 offers a far grander *cause*, as well as *reason* for that "did, made, or created

sin"; it was part of a *heritage* that He should do so. Genesis iii. is the very source of Galatians iv. 1, as Isaiah lix. 16 shewed the sources of the promptings. But this is part of the reserve.

"Selfishness," however, is not the true exponent of "*Sin.*" Our great Epistle gives us a negative clue to it at v. 13. "Until Law, that is, ver. 20, *before Law entered slily into us*," "*Sin*" was in Cosmos — *afloat, diffused in every organism;* "sin," too, is not incorporated, while Law is scarcely in being; yet the death (*its issue*, James i. 15) reigned as king from Adam to Moses, by whom "*the* Law was given," as well as upon those intervening, though scarcely having SINNED upon the similitude of Adam's defaulting."

I have said 'a *negative* clue.' It is, οὐχ ἐλλογεῖται, "*is not incorporated*," or, as we now say, '*concrete*'; and "yet it was in cosmos." "Law" was not *ex-tant*, and so, virtually, "scarcely had being; yet the death reigned." That is, "the death reigned" *before* "the Law was given by Moses." Hence we have iii. 20, about "*Law*," not "the Law," as E. V.; and our great passage, vii. 7; and in the same vein comp. Gal. iii. 13, "Damnedable *be* or *is* every one having been hanging upon a tree," quoted from "*the* law," as contrasted with "*Law*" (not in E. V.) in first clause. It was even so; that very '*accident*,' so to speak, under *privilege*, "the law," were abominable, penal, fatal; but the very same '*accident*' under "Law," though mortal and conclusive, is in the *regular course of the nature* of 'animals,' as all animal life proves.

I feel well at what disadvantage I write and think, while I thus leave out the very *heart* of such passages; but it may prove in the end advantageous to those who revere the Bible, as well as to those who feel the forces of nature. It is undoubtedly on the ground of the strength of those forces that we have 1 John iii. 4 and v. 17; but hardly *critical*

satisfaction can be gathered from those in E. V.; collate John viii. 34. So compare James i. 14, 15, with 1 Pet. i. 7. There can be little doubt that all these three Apostles had not only well remembered the clenching argument at Antioch (Gal. ii.), had also assented to the conclusion there, but had also seen most, if not all, of St. Paul's Epistles. We are discussing *the natural;* I refer, therefore, to the four *as men,* not to One Informant common to all.

Here particularly I refer to St. John. He uses two important words as characterizers of "Sin," ἀνομία, ἀδικια. Admit the ἀ is *priv.* or *neg.* in both words; but neg. of what? Of νομος? Of δικη? No indeed. We have before referred to this *l* as *q. d. tributive,* or *servitory* (to bring in St. James's θρησκεία), and therefore pass on.

Now St. Paul's great characterizer is παραπτωμα, παραπτωσις, in this Epistle to Romans. Once he uses the compound, Acts xxiii. 3, παρανομ-, which E. V. quite misplaces, and "*contrary to*" is quite wrong. It is, "even thou, seated down, judging me after THE Law, and BYE-LAWING biddest me to be beaten!" St. Peter is the only Apostle, and he but once (2 Pet. ii. 16,) who uses the noun; about Balaam, ἰδίας παρανομίας, "his own BYE-LAWRIES," as contrasted with his ass's "*Law.*" Can anything be more suggestive and corroborative of this view?

But, remembering St. James's fine expansion of St. Paul's illustration, to this latter we recur, Rom. vii. 7. Both draw upon, not ἐπιθυμία, ill-rendered "*lust,*" and perhaps equally so "*covet,*" but from τὴν τε ἐπιθυμιαν, *Paul,* ὑπὸ τῆς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμιας ἐξελκ καὶ δελ, *James.* This is especially important in James; he says, "the ἐπιθ, having taken hold, or 'conceived,' bears 'sin'; THE 'sin' too being finished off whelps forth death." This last verb is suggested by κύων, "*dog,*" because '*cynics*' (Phil. iii. 2) has a well-known meaning in English *cynical,* though its figurative sense be '*vague.*' The

word here, though short of that, as *vacuo, vago,* has still many Scripture expressions which would support it—particularly such as "belch," "vomit," "spue," and others; for it *really* differs from "*whelping,*" though '*litters forth*' would be suitable. It seems as if we don't quite *know* whence or how this surly cynical mood of a man either *springs* or *ends* in such an issue as "*death,*" anarthrous. It seems, however, quite plain that St. James goes back to the story as given in Gen. iii. 6, rendered, marg. "a *desire* and a tree to be desired." I give the Hebrew *order,* adhering to E. V. *words,* "And saw the woman, *Item* [כי = ὅτι], good was a tree for eating, and, *Item,* a very desire for eyes, and desirable *is* a tree for making wise," &c.

There are *three* words used to convey the ideas intended:—

1. "*Good,*" טוב, LXX., καλὸν τὸ ξύλον, העץ. The Greek word, from our Lord's own parable, is surely connected with αλς, *sal-is,* "*salt,*" and 'א prefix. We might English it, = *of* "*savour,*" = *savoury* not here only, but throughout Gen. i. (if καλ-ος = טוב, though there can hardly be a question but that some form of συ, τυ, as συf, τυf [comp. *tuus*], as a wife to a husband, or a child to a parent, is the Hebrew idea, *q. d. a respondent*), as well as old Isaac over Jacob's "savoury *goat*" instead of "*venison,*" is the idea.
2. "*tree*"—העץ, LXX. τὸ ξύλον. It is unnecessary to try the Hebrew, since the quotation above from Gal. and "the Law" abundantly interpret it—"having hung himself ἐπὶ ξύλου, upon *a tree.*" This genitive ἐπὶ ξύλου is an addition implied, akin to that in ἐπικαταρ; and the sense to be what in law is called *felo-de-se, i. e.* not 'suicide' only as a madman might commit, but '*wilful* suicide.' One cannot but remember our Lord's "willing cession of Himself," which

ended in this very '*case*' at 'the *hands* of wicked' Romans," but at the *wilful* infamy of "wicked" Jews.

3. "a very desire," ἀρεσὸν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἰδεῖν; the allusion is certainly strong, however we read the Hebrew pronoun תאוה־הוא; surely אוה or או is the radical with תי pref. Gr. θ. We may, I believe, render all, "*the very thing* eyes-wise," or as far as eyes can tell.

4. "and desirable is"; LXX. ὡραῖόν ἐςι τοῦ καταναησαι; Hebrew נחמד. This Hebrew may be rendered best *lovely*, Vulg. Lat. *delectabile*; "from the *contemplation*," *consideration*, &c., &c.; or "from the having *schooled* it," &c., &c.

5. If to all this we read ξυλον, as a form of 'κ-συλ-αω, and remember the perhaps peculiarly Jewish rite, the picture seems complete.

Now it is remarkable how all *profane* history shows the outer world to have caught the literal translation, as if so familiar, and yet missed the associations equally discernible. The metaphorical *excitement* is caught at; the becloudings of normal repose are not. Yet Rom. viii. 21 hints at this as *natural*, though hardly *native*, to the man. So, too, 1 Tim. iii. 14 has the same allusion. It is very notable that *Mohammedanism*, חמר, has amplified the male joy as perpetual, Romanism has deified the female among the μακαρες; although, I must add, in a more sensuous than sensual vein! Yet in both instances, these are the summits of beatitude; both are states of *ex-citement!*

St. James corrects this implicitly in our verses; but St. Paul very plainly out-and-out at 1 Cor. xi. 14, as Nature does in the repose of the male, even when *be-Jewed*. I think it is quite plain that St. Paul infers from *natural behaviour* that reticence and repose are normal; and that

exultation, *ec-sultation*, and exaltation, *ec-saltation*, are right or wrong according to rule and "Law."

It follows, therefore, that, time and tide suiting, ἐπιθυμία is not in itself abnormal. Every 'Spring' all Nature is exuberant, proving the prior advent of ἐπιθυμία. But all Nature also proves that it is not always "Spring;" not always Aurora in the ascendant; that Winter has its turn for 'hybernation' and repose; for embryonomy, rejuvenescence, and denouement, before 'glorious Summer' is made out of 'our Winter of discontent.' Why should *we* have less severe and excommunicating 'winters' than other animals? But *we have;* and yet are 'discontent.' Being so, however, as it is most patent we are, even in this respect and phasis, it becomes us to weigh well the difference between fig-leaf modesty and genuine. "Occupy till I come," is a mighty advice!

Now it is for want of this "occupation," healthy, natural diversion, that *this* mischief seems to spring. It is paradoxical so to say, but it is true, that healthy, wholesale diversion as we are, is conducive to the maintenance of what we are: so luxuriant is Nature. Were we really diverted, acuminated at the vertex on our "watch-tower," and watching our *whole* business in due times and seasons, the *partial* would be less influential, or at least effective. But this, it seems, is too much to be expected; for Human Nature, as it is, is more redundant than other animal nature. Strange, however, that riches should be our snare.

When, then, we read in "the Law," "Thou shalt not covet," that is, "sorely desire" (Gen. xxxi. 30), vast desire being actively instinctive at intervals by "Law"; if we read, "THOU shalt not"—we see the duty, as well as immunity, of *privilege*. Consequences may be unimportant in the eye of the Libertine which are quite pregnant even to the Liberal; dreadful, horrible, to the 'mortified' and consciously vividly

Mortal. When even our Lord Jesus Himself, because He was The Christ, used those very same words of Laban's, ἐπιθυμια ἐπιθυμησα, "*with desire I desired*" (Luke xxii. 15), there was not only no "sin," but it was *natural* to the condition of "The Christ," even as *we* can now reverently conceive of it. He knew and bore the consequences. Eve and Adam did not know, yet dared the consequences—not quite defied, but *unbelief'd* them; "*hoping*" otherwise. "By that hope we were saved," indeed; but they were "made ashamed" by it, "because the love of the God was not shed abroad in their hearts by the Holy Ghost which he hath given into US"! Through this, we ought to be "greater than John the Baptist," or even Adam and Eve; but yet not a whit less *natural* in *kind*, only in *degree*, with times and tides. We forget that if we are *natural to* the new constitution thus favoured, conditioned, though "*new creations*" or "*off-sets*," like 'colonies,' *scions*, we are like the English are in Australia, English still. '*Time* works wonders,' and makes them Australians perhaps, but much rather their children. It takes us a long time to "forget the things that are behind, and reach forth unto those that are before;" for "not attained" even Paul was towards the end of his "course" when he wrote thus his experience.

Now then, when we come to talk of the nature of "sin," we learn that that depends on *the nature of the case*. This is what Rom. vii. 7—a mere link in a great chain of argument—states. And I am persuaded that *the words and figure* of his illustration are his own interpretation of God's scarcely metaphorical expostulation with Cain, at Gen. iv. See Parkhurst's Lexicon on the place; and we find that a most extraordinary metaphor has been supposed, even that Cain had a house with a door, that he was doing wrong in it, and that a wild beast sprung on him therefor—which said wild beast was "Sin." This is exaggeration, if not also

incongruous. This 'metaphor,' if so it be, of the Hebrew is, I am persuaded, thus interpreted, I believe even translated, into ἀφορμην λαβοῦσα ἡ ἁμαρτία; not "taking occasion," E. V., nor "lieth at the door," E. V., nor 'crouching ready to spring,' Parkhurst; but "*having gotten* or *taken* spring."

This is the first occurrence of the word חטא in the Bible; and it is *fertile*, or fem. *noun*, חטאת. It is no kind animal, allowing itself to be victimized, "as a sheep is led to the slaughter, and a lamb before its shearers is dumb," but a sneaking beast of prey. But how comes it to be "THE sin"? Cain was not a murderer at that time; neither is החטאת, *the* sin, the Hebrew reading. St. Paul reads at Heb. xi. 4 about Abel positively, but scarcely even negatively about Cain. "By belief a better, or larger, sacrifice Abel beyond Cain proffered to the God"; Cain's then was deemed lesser or worse — than Abel's, *not than par;* only that a "sacrifice" *aims at above par.*

Aims at, — and "misses," shall we say then? This is how this verb is understood at Judges xx. 16 — "every one could sling stones at an *hair-breadth* and *not miss.*" This is quite a mistake; the word rendered "hair" (for 'breadth' is in italics in E. V.) is properly a *chink, cleft,* or 'bull's eye'-*hole;* and every man could "sling his stone" through that '*without leaving a mark*' on the sides or edges, but *clean through.* This is the picture; the reverse of our rifle-practice. No doubt it may be otherwise; as if it described the *discus* by אבן, instead of the *target,* with a hole for bull's eye; but in either case אל־השערה is as fairly regarded as *the fissure* or *the hole,* as LXX. τριχα, "the *hair.*" In the one case יחטא means 'glance off,' perhaps; in the other 'leave its *mark.*' There is no warrant for LXX. ἐξαμαρτ, which, with τριχα, perhaps suggests *discus-practice.* I examine this at this length because Parkhurst thinks it conclusive.

Both Cain and Abel proffered "sacrifice," θυσια; Abel's

is preferred. "And Cain was wroth, and his countenance fell"; note the *order;* first wrath or anger, then dejection or depression. We might have looked for a contrary order, as if from *reaction;* but no, if we apply the instance and argument at Rom. x. First, "zeal," as of primogenitureship or "birthright," — "I go, Sir, and went not; but afterwards," &c.; then depression, and *then* reaction, or revenge and "provocation," xi. 11; for though *Abels* as to juniority by nature and priority "by election," many prove to be "bound as to the right hand," *i. e.*, '*but left*-handed,' like the slingers above, *dexterous and adroit as they profess to be.* Now *Cains* "afterwards '*repented*' and went," may be deemed the great suggested contrast.

But now the expostulation, Gen. iv. 7. "Why? —— If thou do *well, i. e., savouringly,* wilt thou not be gratified," — for already by nature you are the elder son? "And if thou not do savouringly, 'sin' starts up into the blank." That is, not only *dis-ap-pointment* from what thy birth-right claimed, but — a blank, a void, speedily filled by an alien. Now that alien is the opposite to that ἐπιθυμία which, referring to θυσια, *thusia,* "sacrifice," ought to be our 'enthusiasm'; both being grounded on "*the belief*" which *seemed* to prompt the former.

Any thing like this being so, and I feel persuaded it is so, we may urge further that this *tenth* command of the Law is in the "*second* table." However safe this *epi-thusia, epithumia,* may be for *you* to shew towards God, it is not safe for *you* nor *your* neighbour, that YOU shew it TO HIM, unless time and tide serve for 'good Samaritanism.'

Again, observe how "*Love* your enemies" is explained to "love your neighbour as *yourself*"; we cannot ken a higher object. It has not *naturally* occurred to us to ask — "And who is" *my-self?* — as well as "my neighbour"? So the Saviour leaves all thus; "Whatsoever ye would

that *men* should do *to you*, even so do *ye to them*." It is thus brought to sheer *duty*; first *fulfil this*, and *then* we *may* have some grand 'works of supererogation' for God as *surplusage*. What an arrant conceit!

For, if the knowledge, ἥδειν, of "the Law" come through ἐπιθυμησις, and the ἐπιθυμια were *my own* [ἰδία, *James*], and therefrom I had even the smallest notion [ἔγνων] of "*the sin*," which is its progeny (or fellow or antagonist? — or, what not?) — my very neighbour's resentment at my ill-timed, or mistaken, however well-intentioned, offices *shew that I was wrong somehow*. I hope to submit this limping analysis to the writer of '*Ecce Homo*' for his judgment and consideration.

"Sin" then is the prolific principle which St. James writes of, the abnormal Principle active within and monopolizing us if we be non-natural, *untrue to ourselves*, as St. Paul goes on about. But St. James, at i. 14, is not a whit behind; his metaphors may be compared to '*fishing*,' on the presumption that the fish is "hungering and thirsting after" something more than 'satisfaction,' which is real "contentment," even longing after 'gratification.' He says "each *man*, too, is tried or tempted under ["of"] his own '*epithusiasm*' being drawn out of *himself or proper business to be attended to*, and allured *by his fancy-bait, and so*, δελ-, *delighted*. Whence the 'epithusiasm,' having caught *the bait*, de-*tects*, uncovers, projects 'sin,' ἁμαρτ, δολ-ος, *dol*-us, *a hook*, by *smart* of *prick*, '*sting*,' &c.; and the ἁμαρτ, *sin*, being finished off or forth snarls forth death." We have a variation from the former rendering which E. V. suggested. Here evidently ἡ ἰδία ἐπιθυμία, *i. e.*, '*the epithusiasm proper*,' that is, *peculiarly referred to, covers a hook;* the covering "*entices*," *allures*, *a man out*, and *delights* him by the eye, fancy, curiosity, &c. Will he *resist* this lure and delectable-

ness? Is he *so* "*advanced* a man," μακαριος, as to "endure, ὑπομενεῖν, full-trial, becoming proof" by this test?

It must be granted that all this is '*taking high ground*,' fixing a lofty standard; but yet the "proof" is reached by '*stooping* to "endure" and conquer;' to come out "*scarcely* saved." Moreover, this is "the law of justiness, or rightiness," that is, of some *akin to* justice and rightness, νομια, δικια, as Peter says — If the right-e-ous or just-i-ous, *scarcely be saved, &c.* This is far short of *justice* and *right*; but grant that it suffices. But does "the Law," as exhibited in high feather by Judaism, or Romanism, or Ritualism, or Legalism, pretend *sub-ficiency* only? Not a bit of it; "Elect," elated, — *ergal;* and stepping-stones are worn out, effete. I say it is *prodigiously* 'high ground' that is *taken.* "UNTIL John the kingdom of heaven suffered — aye, and suffereth, violence" *like this,* and *ad inferna* as well as *ad astra!* But does such healthfully and healthily walk the earth as θρησκεία — a '*balm-carrier*, at this day, as such high profession warrants the expectation of? Are the 'absolution and remission of sins' thence afforded *healthily comforting?* If so, was the 'confession' of the said 'sins' wholesale and genuine? Surely, if we properly scan the history of Judaism, with a prestige far more venerable than Romanism can affect, and read that off by the Jews of our time, and much more those of a few centuries back, we must stand aghast at such a revival of Fig-leaf-ism!

But observe again that St. James starts with the proposition of α διψυχος ἀνὴρ, E. V. "*double-minded man.*" Now *this* word "man" here, means a *husband;* the very *figure* St. Paul starts Rom. vii. with. But this is not '*begging* only the question'; nor *begging* only the answer; it is *seizing* the answer. It is not only claiming the *privilege*, "the law," but usurping the *estate*; — "the law" indeed, only

that the law-*force* is non-plused, non-suited, because defunct. *Is this* "the way to have learned, *math'd*, Christ,' *really?* Is this the way to *mate* Christ and *check-mate* "sin"? Paul aims at giving *stale-mate;* for he quietly goes off into "brethren," who with himself are ἀνθρωποι, *humanity*. To read of "a double-minded *husband*-'man,'" — another figure, is like a man "putting his hand to the plough and, looking back" for something, thinks his furrows will be straight, all right. St. Jude's language, "twice dead," seems far more suitable; for he immediately adds, "*eradicated*." This is true: "*the root* of the matter" is torn out of the soil; and his short Epistle is addressed to "beloved" ones.

If St. James had used διψυχος ἀνθρωπος it would be really strange; for it is proverbial that we 'cannot *properly mind* two things at once,' as we can handle; which seems correctly to imply that we have not *two minds*, nor a "*double mind*." This is not *fair* to St. James's word. By analogy with every compound of δι-, it is δια, not δις, except as διπλοος; and beyond question his words mean 'a divided-*souled* husband.' For '*mind*' is not his word; it is 'soul,' or 'life,'— (as E. V.) "a *double-souled* husband." *This*, then, is the very idea which we saw in Ep. to Cor.; "a *soul*-like *man*, ἀνθρωπος, does not understand" such things; is "a divided-souled *husband*," ἀνηρ, more likely to do so, 'or less likely'? He will, as St. Paul to Rom. argues, or at least the *wife* will, "understand" something about "adultery," whatever the "man," as St. James (in E.V.) calls him, may do; but not the "man," St. Paul calls him, necessarily. No? Is the 'celibate' then more likely to do so, or less likely?

Do we not see somewhat the danger here about the *epithusiasm*? Do we not see that the ἐπι- may be a poor stop-gap for the δι-, and much more for ὑπὸ as a *sub*-stitute? "Is there not a cause" for alarm?

Now I say, grant that this is 'taking high ground,' *prestige* if you will, *prodigious*, yet it is very, very low to what Paul takes; and as to *prestige*, it is but "of yesterday" — "nothing" in respect of our "knowing" about it, as Job averred. I was chagrined some twenty years or more ago to receive from a learned English clergyman this reply to a letter on a philological question which had first been welcomed, about the *most* common Hebrew word for "sin," חטא, in this curt form — "but we all know what it means, and so," &c. Curt as it was, it 'shut me up' and the correspondence. But I have mused on it ever since; for I very much question its correctness, though I fear most men would assent.

Who are the "*we all*"? In what sense is "know" intended? Then, "what it *means*"? I'faith, I am of opinion that we can "know" in either or any sense, preciously little until we "know" in a consecutive and corresponding sense how uglily it *ends*. For we cannot "know" the *mean* until we "know" its beginning and end. But then this, 'high ground' as it is taking, is but a *loop* though a *knot* in a great line of *life* and *motion;* and if instead of a *line* we take in *space* and time of *being*, we had better say, with Job, "we know *nothing*." This view too is amply comprised by our great Apostle in Rom. ix. x., as Isaiah represents long before: "The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib; but My people doth not know, Israel doth not consider. Ah! foolish people!"

Our Lord Himself talked of "*expediency*,' say 'comfort,' συμφερει, for us in His going away, — for He would send — One — who should *confute* the world *of sin* [!], of justi-ness, or righti-ness, and crisis." Could nothing short of this "confute the world" and *us*, *most* of us, who are not only in but of the world, of "sin," and yet any of us "*know what sin means*"? What is "*the world*," ? is as

curious as What are '*we all*'? According to analogy, and by abundant Scripture metaphor, κοσμος, *cosmos*, as 'κ-οσμος may be the "smell," odour, exhaling the *exhalation* of and therefore off of, out of, somewhat; and, in general, the *ornaments* of a system or compages. What are "*we all*"?

Since *ornament* betokens "dower," and "dower" favour and privilege, and privilege is exceptional law, and "we" claim privilege, "we" should *be* the tip-top of the ornamentation. Is it so? It is a mere blinking and fig-leaf-ing of the proposal to say, as an excuse, that 'nothing human is perfect.' For is *that* what is '*meant*'? Certainly not. 'Taking high ground' is intended to convey the idea to outsiders that such ground is *not merely* 'human.' And such taking and taking and taking of it "stupefies" the beholder; may it not intoxicate the toiler? For what says the Roman satirist? '*Parturiunt montes et nascitur mus*,' — *mus* alias מוּת, μυθ-, *mut*-us, *myth*, *my*-stery; the Hebrew word is "*death*"; and this, too, St. James traces out, as we saw above. But even 'death and damnation' are playthings to be *bought and sold* still by a downright *celibate*-man! The strength of Protestantism is *not to know*, not even to '*opine*' except diffidently, (which is too near διψυχος to be safe,) but to *believe*, perhaps '*to faith*.'

Let us wind up on the word "*know*." In our text, Rom. vii. 7, the *same* word "known" E. V. has *two* originals in the Greek. The distinction has lapsed from living English language, and no doubt Providentially, since *two* eyes see *one* object at one moment; and the Latin is not responsible for the lapse. This is a wide thesis, through which, however, the Light is plainly visible, which I waive here.

The "nay I had not known the sin," E. V., should be ἀλλα, *yet, still,* or *nevertheless* the sin I had not known," but more correctly "*knew* not." It is the aorist, and the

verb means *mind*-"know"; and may be rendered *I notioned not*, or rather still, *not notioned I*. Again, "*the* sin," for it is defined by correlation with "*the* law,' as "*sin;*" but by this "*notional*" correlation with *me*, who am under "Law," though not "*the* law," it is definite, and so becomes "*the* sin." Now the reason.

τὴν τε γαρ ἐπιθ. "For this adjunctive to *epithusiasm* not *wist* I, except *the* law did lege — not *epithume* shalt, or wilt, thou." This last '*wist*,' or '*wot*,' is our lost, or obsolete word for *sense*-"know." That is to say then this *defining definite* — the *hook* within epithusiasm or *underneath* it, or *between* it — "I wist not, except," &c. By these alterations for ἐπι we perceive it to be a correlative with δια; something like *a cork for a bottle;* but whether the bottle or *bait* be full or empty is only wist by us by *drawing the cork*, or *unsheathing the sting and barb of the hook*. It is hardly necessary to say then that I regard this particle enclitic τε as of the highest moment; but it will be something new to speak of its identity with the δ of ἤδειν. To this I venture to advance; but it seems important to bear in mind these *two* quite different sources of our *one* term — "*know*."

There is doubtless another; for St. John, at 1 Ep. i. 1, speaks of at least *two* "ears and eyes' as furnishing food for ἐθεασαμεθα, *q. d.*, we *mind*-"saw"; but also a *third*, "hands," *q. d.*, for "handling" to conviction. And, notice, that all these are engaged on somewhat "*about* the Logos of the Life."

I have not a very small apparatus for my adventure; but after an original thought so far as I know which flashed through my mind, Conant's Gesenius' *Hebrew Grammar* is the main source of help to fortify my congesting idea.

Very very much to contract my many years' speculation on the Hebrew word חטא, I assert at once, as the most probable of many probable and far more possible etymologies,

that it is חטא. Lest I forget to name it too, that its *true* equivalent in Greek is κτα-, κτη-; or if we *must* introduce a phonetic vowel, it is κατα.

I write with some confidence what I here say, and beg study.

The change from the ט to Greek τ, Latin *t* is rendered probable in Gesenius' *Lexicon;* I believe it to be so *general* as to be a safe rule. I suspect that although we may not quite correctly sound ט in English, there is no other language so nearly approaches. I even go so far as to suspect that present Hebrew text at Judges xii. 6, so long ago as when the Chaldee characters rendered the ancient Hebrew or Aramaic, that the *sign* of the real *test* was lost; for the *sh*, or German *sch*, is by no means difficult nor rare, any more than the simple *s;* that *shib-*, or *sib-* were equally easy, though later a redundance of 'sibilants' pervades *all* languages. Not so with *th*, which is perhaps peculiarly English. A French gentleman once stated his difficulty with 'your *th;* it has such a kind of *wheezling* sound.' Just so; it is not a *full* 'sibilant.' Whether *Shibboleth* or *Sibboleth* was the word, the difficulty was to distinguish it by the tongue from *Shibbolet* or *Sibboleth*. The present Hebrew has שבלט and סבלת; and this corresponds with the Latin *t*, but the Greek θ. Our Anglo-Saxon had even a *-dth* and *th*, as in '*this*,' 'thin.'

I think it has not been noticed that the *dth* is almost, if not quite, confined to our pronouns and pronominal offsets; and *th* to all other words. Thus it always has *th* as *third* pers. suffix of our verb; while *st* as invariably of our *second* pers. of verb. But the *second* person is what I am driving at; and there can be no question that its correlative is the digamma.

Now for the latter Dr. Donaldson distinguishes (*New Crat.*) a pronominal and a consonantal value; I plead a

correspondent in its correlative fellow. The pronominal of the former is always seen as h, u, v, w and y; the consonantal as b, f, h, p; the former are *liniguals* and buccals; the latter are *labials* and buccals. The *dth* is a *sublingual*, the *th* an almost pure *lingual;* of the former there is plenty of illustration in E. V. I wonder what the Sanscrit makes of this; Nordheimer, as to the *Article,* shews amply the difference between Hebrew and Arabic; and shews that *l*, which is *nearly* identical with a *Sanscrit* article, is the real *Arabic* article. If this hold good about the pronouns also, since *l* is in Greek, Latin, and all modern languages now a consonant, then the consonants of the pronouns may be more important than their vowels, both in Hebrew and Greek, to a great extent.

This is a great point, even as a probability. I have endeavoured to look into it so far as it seems to have a bearing on the three synonyms grammatically—חטא, ἁμαρτία, "*sin.*" I have written off freely, not wasting time in verifying references, because much more competent persons will do that for themselves, if found necessary. Yet I have not written without deliberation.

Section 7.

An attempt at philological examination.

There are two or more Sections; running the one into the other, and I fear very tiresome to read; but once more I crave patience. I wished a friend to undertake the expression of my thoughts. He said, 'Every mind must express its own thoughts,' and declined, urging me, however, to shape them. I have done my best. The Papers are separated as No. 1 and No. 2.

No. 1.

THE *Hebrew*. That חטא is compound there can be no doubt. It may be venturous to assert that Rom. vii. 24, first clause, actually *translates*, though it interpret and apply the meaning of this Hebrew. Yet I believe it is even so.

Of course, the suffix, *as it seems*, is *contra*, the actual *root*; א = ἐγω ἀνθρωπος; for the אן of אנכי = ἀν-ηρ; but ηρ = αἴρ-ω; whereas αν-θρωπος = αντι-, ρ = λ, and ωψ modified. Now this modified form, ανθρωπος is always St. Paul's term for the *human*, while ἀνηρ is St. James's. As to ρ = λ, or *vice-versa*, we may consider them as a kind of Sanscrit digamma; for together they are a Sanscrit vowel, *ll*, *llr*; compare *e. g.* λώπη a *robe*, from λεπω, λ-έπω, *leper*, *leopar-d*; and ῥωπ· *leap*—among many other perhaps stronger instances. But if λωπη may be referred to λεπω, we *may* refer ωψ thither too, though ὀπτ and ὁραω be convenient; for a *look* may express more than a *word*.

The Apostle's word, ταλαιπωρος, turns pretty much upon the π. If we read *Horus* = the *Sun-God* in Egyptian, whence *Hora*, *Houri*, ωραῖος, &c., then perhaps the π is this aspirate; but we have not therefore its value.

That ταλαι is connected with τλαω, and so through Latin *tul-i*, *t-latus*, with *fero quasi* αἴρω, we arrive at the above epithet, to ηρ, ἀνηρ, ἄνερος, ανδρος; its 'poetic syncopated imperative' is τετλαθι, suppose then its *objective* were τλαθ-, τληθ-; and τλαθ-υμος, as if second personal pronoun, not τλα-θυμος.

If this be such 'imperative,' what would be its similar *postulative* but τλακ-, or τλαπ, or τλαβ-, as seen in λαμβανω, ληψω, &c.? The commutations of κ, π, out of the old *quoppa*, are quite plain in the dialects, as see Latin and Sanscrit amply. But the *responsiveness* of τ, as to κ, π, that is, the ἀντι, or

vis-a-vis correlation, has become too distorted into *antagonism*. Now I doubt not that thus it is the *relative* pronoun has come to be associated with the interrogative only, as in English who, which, what; but our *that, this, thee, he*, are quite as truly *relatives* as demonstratives or objectives.

Thus rendered then, ὡρος, fully written = θωρος, θεωρεω; and its κατα προθεσιν, or prepositional *relativeness* is indicated.

So τλακ, τλαβ, similarly expressed, becomes τλαϸ, and seen in λαχ now, from λαγχανω, and thus its similar *relativeness* is indicated. Compare poor Peter's λαχοῦσι at 2 Pet. i. 1.

This being so, the π here actually amounts to *ength*, as in English *length, strength*, &c.; that is, it is διψυχος, so to speak, has a really *divisible force or 'soul.'* In other words, we recall the "slingers," the "elect," or choice men, of whom we quoted above the book of "Judges." E. V. calls them "*left*-handed," jumping to this conclusion because the Hebrew says, their *right*-hand was "bound" from some cause, either by damage or *preoccupation*; the LXX. oddly reads, ἀμφοτεροδεξιοι, and so the Vulgate has *ita sinistra ut dextra*; in short, *ambidexter*. This is a very strange and estranging perversion of the Hebrew. I would *interpret* the Hebrew as implying, as in most languages, that there is a 'right and *left*,' which remains to be seen if equal to 'right and *wrong*.' These slingers (as many a left-handed man since, proverbially) were "elect," choice, picked, 'proper' men, and, because dexterous and adroit, very ugly, awkward, askew 'customers to deal with.' All these words are most pertinent to our *thesis of enquiry*. So this very phrase again!

Now I see in the Hebrew חם, the English '*quoth*';—no, *that* is rather in -πωρος ἐγω ἀνθ; if we adhere to Gesenius's evidence about ם, the Hebrew is *quot*-ies, or *quat*-enus, &c.;

but is all answered by *toties, tot.* If this ט *be* correct, it is exceptional in the Greek correspondence, except as *there*, too, what goes by the name of 'euphony' sometimes requires such, as καθ for κατ-α. What then if such 'euphony' and poesy be stronger *rule* than 'grammar'? We suggested the same above in the test-word Shibboleth, Sibbolet; not confining the 'aspirate' to the s, but claiming a *'per-spirate'* for the final test. This is here our problem, *our proboleth,* or *probolet.*

There is no question but that θ is (I use my word) a *perspirate;* as a finial this is easy now, when *terminal,* but very hard as *initial.* But we have even *two* sounds for it in English, as our Anglo-Saxon has *two* symbols. I believe that *dth* is nearly a kind of *second-pronoun* only, and further indicates *genitive* as to *case,* as it were, and in Hebrew a *gender,* of which it has two only. While *th* pure, the nearest to the sibilant, is of *third-pronom.* power. This I leave. But see its analogue preserved in the *first* personal pronoun; in full the Hebrew is *anch-i.* This has dropped out in the second personal pronoun אתה, where (θ = ת) the corresponding sound (then *living* in Chaldee) is *anth-e,* perhaps *angth-e;* the *th* second person sing. The *ng* sound of the first person is preserved in εγω, *ego,* for even ע is a dual of י, as א is in another aspect; but we see nought of it in the second person *obvious.* Where is it? What is it?

Now the liquids, *l, m, n, r,* seem to be *two* sets of a digamma in Sanscrit; I say *two,* for the *l* and *r* are vowels or vocal, and one pair; the *m n* are also vocal, and another pair. The former may be lost by *visarga,* or ecthlipsis; the latter is prolonged as *anu-swâra,* the Arabic *tenwin, tenuin,* or *twang.* Here in our word *twang* we have apparently the 'perspirate' of any personality third; best or least known to its *s-el-f. This* word *self* contains the other digamma *l;* and the

final *f* is some form of the Œolic digamma; compare *selbe, selves*, with *self;* also suitable to any personality.

But this *ng*-power, supposing it = *m, n*, what is implied by its lapse from the second person? Is it lapsed? We should look for it in some shape, if not; and the most likely form seems to be the corresponding digamma (as for convenience I call it) *l, r*, or *ll, llr*. Is it not probably, then, in that very word *self?*

What its force? The Œolic digamma = *f*, the suffix or *self;* its other power then may = λ or ρ, or perhaps λρ or ρλ. Is not its value shewn in the word *dual*, which grammar refers to 'number'? It must be an *initial* power, like ל, as in λ-αμβ, λ-αβ, λαγχ, λαχ, but may be *visargaed, cropped*, as in *ambo*, ἀμφι, ἀκ-μη. This, however, is a determinative force; what would be its response but a *hiss*, or *'ds*, or צ, or ז? The last symbol is quite a Moses-picture. Now we allow צ = *ts*, but ז = ζ, *i. e. ds* or z. I conceive there is just this difference between י and ו; which brings us *close to* ן final נ. And as *n, ng* = first person, so j, z, *dg, ds* = second person.

But what have these to do with *l* and *r*? As *m, n*, are *formative*, because *finial* at all, so are *l, r*, determinative or 'genitive'; we then want a '*causative*,' or 'instrumentative,' *answering to the genitive* as a 'locative.' I see it in this very ז, ζ, j, &c.; compare ζα, δα, δια; and lastly, in dz, *ds, dth*, not in *th;* for I conceive that *dth* has a *second* personal value, and *th* a *third*, as *modification of the first*. Hence I further imagine that the Apostle's ταλαι-, from τλαω, is the finial of θλαω, θλῖψ, θηλυ, &c.

What then of חט־א? Accepting the rule, ט = τ, and is therefore not at all a sibilant, but a dental, a *bit-off* thing; were it חת־א, *i. e.* ת = θ, as an initial it is the relict of a 'perspirative,' *q. d.* πνεύμα. Complying with the rule then,

as a medial, which it is between ה and א, its effluence is both 'fore and aft'; while as an initial, תא, it is a determinative, *q. d.* causative, = το, English *the,* at least. All that remains then is the value of א, ὅ, perhaps ὁ only, or *self.* This a man has to ex-istimate for himself.

Once more; while ח may appear in ἐ-κ or *equ-*, and ט as *z* or *dth,* they can *amalgamate* as κσ into ξ, or as σκ into the old *sanqui* ('*sampi*'). Thus the change as to σκ, or κσ, may be seen under ἐνεπω, in its deflexions; while Latin *inquino* has a separate *intimo.* Collate σκαιος, *askew.* This is best shewn in the perfect and participials. I say participials carefully. Thus πεκω *pexi* = *pecvi, pectum,* &c., &c., &c., akin to the Latin *pec-co.* But it is particularly preserved, though not obvious, in the Greek 'verbals,' and the Latin 'supines'—about which I have much material. These supines are participials, and a terrible *trap* they have proved.

Now it is curious that while חט be participial they are available separately; while if perfect they become κσ = ξ, or σκ = *sanqui* or *samqui*; compare our old English '*umqwhile.*' It is not quite safe to reason by the *order* of the letters; but (see Catafogo's *Arab. Lexicon* for its *ancient* order) it is notable that ξ = X occupies the place of ס, next to ע and פ. The value of X is very ancient, and acknowledged, as a 'mark'; the Hebrew special value of ס is more hieroglyphical, but similar by contrast; for it is the initial of the word *Samaritan, q. d.* Σαμαρτ, damnable in their *skewed* eye and unfair scales. And with this I come to the Hebrew word as a whole.

It is on the important passage at Judges xx. 16, that while seeing the force of Fürst under חטא in one sense, ὑστερ, Rom. iii. 23, "*coming short of,*" E. V., as the Apostle writes, and thus to "*miss,*" &c. I see another from a different point

of view. Fürst's and the usual sense = '*disappointment*'; the sense I offer = *appointment.*

In Fürst's own splendid *Lexicon,* I refer to שִׂעָר, the word in Judges rendered τριχα, in LXX., "hair's *breadth,*" E. V., and to שׂעיר. The passage already referred to, xx. 16, as a *hole,* or *cleft,* for the 'bull's eye' of a *target,* or of a *discus* in another relation.

As 'proffered,' the *victim* of the offerer would be caught and kept in the Temple-'compound,' thus *losing* its liberty, &c., and is *samached* as a victim. The Priest "elects" *one* out of a lot for the sacrifice actual, and then "*sins*" *against it.* All that are in 'the lot' are so *samach'd, sooner or later* (Have you thought of this? They are *samach'd* in the market before they get to that 'compound'!); but when in the compound, as well as when *samach'd,* they are claimed as "Moselytes," "Proselytes"! What a word! I am getting to another sphere!

But 'Holy Church' says that if they are in the 'compound' they are her's; natural. If samach'd, indisputably her's; natural. When selected, she elector, still her's; natural. When victimized, after all her's; natural. "They that minister at the altar live of the altar." All natural in the nature of things. But what are they living off of? Only the victim's πτωμα, or *carcase.* The victim! Sublimed! we say; God says, *exalted*!

'Holy Church' says what is very natural, for she is *Wholly!* She deals in *Wholes.* Not a bit, or scarcely a bit, of it. "My bowels, my bowels"! They are offal. And yet 'Holy Church' *naturally,* samachs, and compounds, and *dogmatizes* δοξα, *glory*; she teaches *doctrine,* but is δοξα forthcoming as response? If so, is the response *reflective* of her own "glory"? Is anticipated *death* mutual, reciprocal, equal? Does the glory of the proselyte and the glory of the

Mother, reflect the glory of the *Father*. For this is the Order; "Let your light so shine, that men seeing your good works may glorify *your* Father," *not you*.

It is very notable, that Holy Church, Lexicographers, &c., have dwelt upon the '*losing* side' for *others*, yet claim 'the winning side' for herself; I mean, as Nature reads winnings and losings. But hereabouts is the *Crucial Point*, which I reserve the consideration of for another mood of mind.

Come then to the Greek ἁμαστ-ία.

If our idea about *samach* and '*christy-crosty*' be valid, it is impossible to agree with Buttmann's suggestion of α *priv.* and μερος. And I hold to it that the former has some validity, meagrely and lamely as I may have adduced the evidence of it.

Without further preamble, I say that ἁμαρτ. is a *verbal*, equivalent to a Latin *supine* in the *intent* of the latter. I gladly embrace Buttmann's verb of μερος in μειρομαι, which in perf. pass. and imperf. carries the augment. But — an augment privative? This is just the *general* mistake of order. The privative is the augment; but we have not got to that. What Rom. v. 20 states is that the very augment is the object of "Law"; but forasmuch as it is not the desideratum of the privileged by "*the* law," *it slips by them* through our inadvertence, as E. V. reads Heb. ii. 1, but the Greek says, "*we slip by them*," — we slip out of the noose, and that *not inadvertently*, but quite naturally on our native side of the scheme. "Analogies" are desperately slippery things for slippery folks to hold, or be held by.

Now, though I reserve the evidence for it, so as to get out a book at all, I assert that the verbals in -τ-ος, thus to be written, are offsets of first aor. pass. But here in ἁμαρτ. we have a very curious departure from a rule of which I find another apparent exception. It retains the perf. pass. body, but alters the perf. augment from εἰ- to ἁ-; for the aorist

pass, I suppose, must he like the aor. act. ἐμ-. Yet I am not so sure of this, because the perf. act. is ἐμ- *for* μεμ. says Buttmann; that would be μεμεμορα! — as if 'the aspirate were a substitute for the reduplication'; he 'concludes' this. I take the liberty to suggest from what we have seen that this very augment upon εἰ-μ-αρτ is the relict of the old א copulated as אי, the נ being omitted or lapsed, which was the original and true copula; and I ask what would the regular first aor. pass. be? I suspect ἐμμορθ, at least, if not nearly אμαρθ in first pers. sing. But as a verbal, -μορτ is regular whatever the ἀ be. Compare the whole thesis in εἰμ-ί.

Then as to the body of the word μαρτ. The μ as shewn above, though anuswâra in most cases, may be also *guna*, γυνη, *gown,*' the *fame, clangor,* brag of א, a kind of κῦδος as well as κῆδος.

We thus cannot get to αρτ pure without violence or lapse; for the μ has a twang naturally, and αρτ *may* have some preferential; or is it gone to help the first augment ἀ? If so, we may compare ἄρης, ἀρι-, ἀριϛος, as we found ζα-, but then all *mulcted, pec-ked, milked, m-αλγ-'d,* and we are very near if not at *amalgam.* For this is very suspiciously, our very idea in the word ἀμαρτ-ία. There is a difference reserved however for λ, ρ, the supposed Sanscrit digamma; and as the ultimate of *llr,* for μαρτ, we may then interpret *μαfτ,* for the first pers., *muft* for the second, *malt* for the third. Whereas if μ, as digammatic must be divided, and imitate the Latin from thence, we get *saft* or *soft, seft* or *suft,* and *salt,* by the same process.

But even -αρτ is an irregular combination except as ρ is a vowel or vocal. This is less plainly seen in English '*alt*' than in *art;* but there is some slipperiness here that it should be so. For, as we have seen, some form of π, κ, or ϸ usually intervenes to form participials. It is true that they

are *be-long-ings* from and off of the stock, and ἄρω *seems* not to carry such, though ἤρθην *seems* also to suggest otherwise. This being the *tantus, tot,* power, we seek its responsive in ἀρκέω, comp. ορκος, '*irk*,' &c. The accentuation shews that it is ἀρκ-έω, not ἀρ-κεω.

Here then the *hiatus* to be supplied is all-significant; for if ἤρθ be the root, the αρ is *blank;* and if we read ἀρκ, we get to ἀρκέω and ἀρχομαι, &c., which, for the former, would be usurpation. One would like to read with Parkhurst μαρπτ-, or again μαρκ-, as we read *farsum, fartum* and *farctum;* but no; that would be just clutching the proof. The word is μαρ-, or ἄρ at the utmost; comp. αρα, *tris,* and ἄρω, ἀραομαι; and if we go from thence to אור could we get to bitterness [*mara*] cursing and burning? But if μαρ be the root-stem, we have many words exhibiting its meaning, particularly μαραινω, *marescere, mark, merc,* marque, &c.; and μαρμαρος, *marble, e.g.,* a sepulchre or tombstone, and μαρμ-αίρω, to *flash* as fire does with new material.

Above all, however, we get μαρτυρ, μαρτυς, &c., as a *tomb* or 'sepulchre' is. A *marcescent* man, *q. d.* a *samach'd* man, is a very *marked* man; but he is neither until he is a *mar*-red man. *Then* he is a "witness" to some damage done; and the *mar* and the *testimony,* which he carries or bears himself, though corresponding to his capacity, may be infinitely below his capability as it is below the measure of the total damage.

I do not meddle with the *Latin,* beyond the few incidentals which have occurred, for we have no certain *authority* in it. In the *English, sin, syn, synne,* we seem to have; and would at once seize συν, *co, con,* as the synonyme. I believe it to be indeed so; but in a different way to what is usually supposed.

From what we have seen above, I think the *n,* as in Hebrew, the really important element, and that it id-*en*-tifies.

In our a, an, it is thought to be but euphonic; I believe *a* to be a corrupt abbreviation; not therefore that *an* = *un*, *unus*. The present *i*, or old *y*, is the simple initial pronoun, with *s* sibilating it, as in *se*, *sin*, and I suspect also *cujus*, not *hujus* perhaps. I see the word in *sean*, a *net*, and *seine*, *sagena*, σαγηνη, of which *seize* is the verb, and *besiege* is akin. I see it again in *sinus*, *sino*, *sinuo*, &c.; in short, a *man* "caught in the very act adulterating," John viii. 4, and Titus iii. 10, 11. I take this to myself while I thus write; and yet am *not* "being self-damned-able," as if I were but "making a snare" in this matter; nor am I aware as I go on that this ought to ensnare, unprofitably, others more than myself. According to my reading it is too valuable a thing to so "homologize my sins" that they and I so coalesce that I am reduced, subjected and subdued to live — only "by belief"! *This* is the prospective and 'promissory' *privilege*. But if "by belief" be the only "security," because the chief if not only channel for "grace," Rom. iv. 16, "where is the vaunting then?" iii. 27. And where the seemliness of prodigality in any ostentatious manner, even of voluntary humiliation, and worship of one's own will?

The "end of *the* law" for privilege is the *mar*-ring of us, that like Jacob we may "*halt*," being crippled or "bound as to the right hand," as the slingers; and *so* "belief is the victory which victors the world," although we be "living, moving, and being" *victims, as 'privileged.'* "Law" underlies all, that we may exhibit or "indicate" privilege as somewhat *more than* naturals, yet not *the less* natural. But "seeming unto men to fast," and "wearing broad philacteried," or *charmed* "garments," do not convey to others an idea of the natural; these rather induce the suspicion that neither "the law" nor "Law" can be either "magnificent or honourable."

No. 2.

It is important to remember that what are called Hebrew *root stems*, are third person singular perfect of verbs, and that in corresponding tenses of this we may find, say, *this* in Greek and Latin. That is not all. The Semitic languages particularly, but also old Greek, read from right to left, contrary to late Greek, Sanscrit, Latin, and our own. How easily transposition takes place, may be seen under ἐνεπω, *inquam, inquit.*

Now *peccat*-um, which I believe to be a 'supine' of active voice, and the *u* is long, *-tûm, -tû, q. d. -tuum, -tuu,* or some modification thereof. This corresponds with the 'verbals' in Greek, as formed on the *stem* of first aor. passive, stripped of all its augmentatives, both initial and terminal. And if, as Max Müller says, the *perfect* is 'past,' as we commonly enough say at school, this seems too much for the purpose of the Hebrew root-stem; while an *aorist*, which is in some sort present, either as first aor. or second aor.-force, is *pro quanto* a 'present'; the perfect is not the *pro tanto*, but the *second* aor. may be so. These aorists may be *vice-versa*; *q. d.* the *first* '*tant*,' the *second* '*quant*.' I hope to give a paper on this matter hereafter; meanwhile see Bopp and Donaldson.

The value of those two *cc*-s is ϛχ, as seen in πασσχω, of which I believe it to be a form. But St. Paul writes πασχα for פסח; so that the true value of ח is ascertained here as χ, not *h*. The Jews of to-day pronounce their Hebrew word as '*pesach*,' the final *h* quite distinct, as in the Scottish "*loch*." Yet beyond doubt, perhaps, it often has the value of κ, π, = *qu* in Latin; but then it is as a *relative*, not an *interrogative*. Thus compare ὅς, πος, and *hujus, cujus*, and the Doric κος, and still more the Ionic κοεω for νοεω. Now ג is main radical in the Hebrew first and second pronouns, though now lapsed

from the second; and ν Greek terminal = *m* Latin terminal, and is the Hebrew 'formative.' Compare εἰμ-ι, *sum*, and εἰν-αι; and τυπτομ-αι, τυπτειν. These seem to be quite explicable in Sanscrit by '*anuswara*,' and '*guna*.'

But while πας, peç, paçis from *pax*, *fœçis* from *fœx*, is thus accounted for, the *cat* = *chat*, χατ-, *i. e.* *-catum* is this very Hebrew word חמ, though ill represented by *t* for ט. It is the same, however, in Greek, rightly by Gesenius's conclusion.

The truth is that ט is a *quasi* 'sibilant' in Hebrew; and then the Greek συ and τυ are *not* identical. For while the Latin has but *tu*, yet in all its so-called reflexes it has *sui*, *sibi*, *se*, &c. Perhaps these are truly 'relatives' rather than 'reflexes,' though the extant 'relative' be *qui*, *quis*; thus in *hic*, *hujus*, *hinc*, *hunc*, I doubt not but that c is ç in every instance, but with the z or j sound preserved in the genitives. In fact it is = *dth* of Ang.-Sax. and English, well shewn up in *New Crat.* § 106; but, further than that, it is distinct from our *th* pure. Thus we shall not correctly find it *caussa*, *causa*, *casa*; the sound approaches ζ, z, and ϊ; and therefore properly differs for j, ι, y — *jung*, *young*. So too, then, our old English '*quoth*' is not synonymous any more than *inquit*. It seems as if the true value is *dth*, as represented *only*, I believe, in the initials of the English def. article and pronouns; *the*, *this*, *that*, *though*, &c., which answer, as *relatives* also, to *who*, *what*, *which*, when these too are *relatives*, rather than *interrogatives*. The true respondent to a bare interrogative is *hic*, not *hiç*, *he*, *it*, ὁ, τό; just as we modify in speech *the* man into *th' man*; very conspicuous is this in the Welsh speech, and even letters. Thus the true value of חמ as to sound is shewn in the Greek χθ-ες, χθ-ονος: compare Job's "for we are but of *yesterday*" — *heri*, not *hodie*.

But now note further that the ancient Egyptian '*Phtha*,' is exactly answered by חמא, as χθα. Is it then improbable

that Coptic may prove the true respondent to φθα, to be θφα, *q. d. Thoth,* or *Thought?* There is only analogous change from *th* to *ght,* as from our *th* to *dth;* and if we compare thou*gh* and thou*ght* (Scotticé) we shall see that χ = ח and θ = ח, but τ = ט, do as really separate, or distinguish, the dental from the *quasi* sibilant sounds as may perhaps be. It is the same with both letters; for φ = π = *f;* while ϟ = κ as ϙ, *qu.* Indeed, it is very much to be observed that all the so-called Cadmæan letters are older ones digammated. It is further noticeable that '*his*' very name, though now written Καδμος, should probably be not χαθ, but χα-θμος; that is, preserving the δ-sound, it becomes the initial *dth* of μ, an objective unit — εἰς, μία, ἕν, of second *pers. gend.* or *case.*

Thus then this μ is divisible, as one would expect from the respective assignments of *m* and *n* in Sanscrit; so I imagine *m* to be really digammated *n;* the latter prevails apparently in the Greek in the nouns, the former in the Latin nouns. Further then, and in all verbs, the enquiry becomes perplexed among cases, genders, numbers, degrees, &c.; although by the verbs not difficult, I suspect, though tedious, to follow it. This μ is important in our Greek synonyme, but *n* in the English.

To return; *peccat*-um as πασχ-α, is peϙχαθ-um; and is meant to be preserved, but is exaggerated by *ia* for ϟ or α, in the word, so expressive, *fasciatum, i. e., faϙχιαθum.* Expressive; for this is just what privilege claims — *semper eadem,* if once. But this is what one considers still a *desideratum* — a thing to come *from the stars,* "not from *man* nor by man."

Now are the remains of this χθ preserved in the verbs? I think so; but as *participials* of some sort; I believe *aorists* in Greek, supines in Latin, through their *perfects.* Thus follow out πεκω, πεξω into ἐπεχθην or ἐπεκθην; the verbal will be πεχτ, or πεκτ, though it may be buried in πεξ, just

as there is also a πεκτεω, which in Latin *pecto*, claims also *pexi, pexum,* though it have too *pectitum* that should be *pectuitum.* But observe that *this* original is, as we have seen, *peç,* and not *pequ;* and further that to which of these two *pecu, pecudis,* or *pecus, pecoris,* belong, is *the* Q. E. D. The former means a *single head* of 'cattle'; the latter a *herd* or *flock* of 'cattle,' &c. The Levitical Code, and 'the East,' shew much more about this; and we find something brief to say in our *Part II.*

What is of more 'political' importance to us, and is the burden of this paper, is, that this is 'running on a rail' quite other than the Levitical Code and the Mosaic Œconomy afford. This has led to a business of commerce and merchandize; which until Luther was most notorious in Romanism. Even "in Jewry," by profession, that astounding performance of Jesus the Nazarene in the Temple with his little whip of cords, like "Samson with the jaw-bone of an ass," proves this degeneracy. And why requisite thus? Because "my house shall be called a House of προσευχη, ad-*or*-atio, for all nations"; that where "*mouth*" to mouth, the "heart" overflows and "speaketh" through it.

The Hebrew is otherwise. Its official "Passovering" from day to day probably fell to cruelty, butchery, stinginess and avarice. It was, all things considered, a bloody business; but, what is more, it was an intimately damning business. This is the view for the Ritualist and Merchandizer to take of it. The *profferer* was mulcted sure enough, and his "sacrifice" "nailed by the ear" to the slaughter-post as his victim, and the Priest did business which consummated the business of both! The one is defuncted; the other is 'absolved,' *and is the scape-goat* or "lot of Azazel," and *ought* therefore to be for ever "damned-able," as Cain was. Under "Law" this is the "full tale" of "the law"—privilege. How extraordinary to see him afterwards strutting

into "the chief places of concourse" again, when by "the law" he was damned-able over and over again! How could this be? By higher "Law" than privilege — "*the* law." "There is an incapability in the law, *i. e.*, privilege, through the debility of the flesh," which should exhibit, or at least "indicate," its operation or "work," but which evades the operation, 'cannot stand it.' So says St. Paul, Rom. viii. 3; and yet though it failed even in God's hand by Moses for so many years, has failed too, to a great extent, by 'the Church' for so many centuries more, there are Priests who defend the continual 'trying on' of it still! It has all become a matter of money or 'doing penance' or something, just as it was in the Temple of the "Jerusalem that now is."

We may accept the phonetic value of the Hebrew letters as at least *like* what we have above seen.

If we read the Hebrew by these values from left to right we have $\alpha\theta\chi$; with the true *pronominal* value of θ, it is $\alpha\zeta\chi$, *adthχ*, with the sibilant, it is $\alpha\sigma\chi$. But as *medial* letter, it combines both sounds, and it is ξ, χ; that is, in Hebrew *religious* value it is ס; and a "lamb" thus *smeared*, or '*samach'd*,' or '*christy-crostied*,' was at once *marcescent*, because *marketed* and *marked;* that is, again, *faxim*, *factum*, and *fastum*, &c., &c.; all true by *Fate*, and hardly otherwise by *Faith*. The '*feast*' of the one is indeed a '*fast*,' ἀρν-, ἀμν-, to the other; neither are as yet *factually* realized, but both are *fated;* collate *forem*, *fore* of *esse*. Now 'conditional,' 'subjunctive,' 'potential' being can be but "prospective" of *future* being; and because the present is of uncertain duration, it is hardly *actual* any more than is the *fate* awaiting it. But μη ὄντος is not real negation; there *is a reality*, and that is πιν, πιf, or πις, which I believe are resolvable into οἶδα, and יד, *fid-o*, but Græcé יר.

The Greek synonyme differs from both Latin and Hebrew.

It has been not unfrequently observed, as I conceive quite correctly, that the whole *issue* of the Levitical Code, as Gal. ii. argues too, is "*belief*" as the real instrument; and it is indeed the very key-stone of *privilege*, "*the* law." Whereas the New Testament argument opens out wholly from "belief" subjective and latent unto "faith" *objective* and *patent;* as if from *fαλη*θ, the deceiving latent, into ἀλη*θ*, the unfalse, patent and true. The former is seen in *fal*-lo, σ-φαλ-λω; perhaps the latter in חלל, "*hal-hal-e*," and "*hallow*," keeping to the proper meaning of the Hebrew '*samach*,' as ritual initiative.

Now if this be at all so, there will be no mistaking of the real, the genuine coin, by the expert. They do not look *ad altum* in the *mean* of things; they give credit to current coin. But even the inexpert will look twice at a brand-new sovereign; 'it *glares* so; that is, it *glairs* or *gloires* so.' Some will remember, with me, the old sixpences and shillings during the French war; so plain, yet so indubitable, that forgeries were confined to the 'one-pound notes.' Those old worn coins had come from 'the mint'; 'the mint' was true, and 'the stuff' was true, or it had not circulated so long.

The "*mark*" of the Angel, "on the foreheads and palms of the hands" of a man does not wear out, it seems, any more than the "*seed* that is within him"; but, on the contrary, the former "grows" by the latter. This consideration alone seems to me to prove that not only Buttmann's reference to ἀ priv. and μερος are not constituents of ἁμαρτανω, but also that this would quite put us on the wrong tack. I offer others on the tack I have sailed, and in my vein.

Of course, everybody will look at Buttmann's '*Irreg. Verbs.*" Under μείρομαι as in L. and S., we have a perf. εἵμαρται, which looks as if it were all we wanted. To my

mind it is insufficient, because a *perf.* and not an *aor.* For I suspect the terminal, -αρτ to be a true 'verbal,' and if so it should have a first aor. pass. parent stem. That which L. and S. give as an *aor.* ἐμμορε, Buttmann says it would be better to take as a *perf.*; good. Then this being regular, the first aor. pass. would be -μορθην, and the verbal -μορτ. This is the Latin *morti* and Greek βροτος; confused, as I think, as ἠμβροτες from the Iliad, with our verb. The terminal -*lα* we have before examined; though note -τ-ανω as = Heb. *first* pers. pron.

But what about the εἰ-μ- of this perf. of μειρομαι? Of the μ, does it belong to -αρτ-, or to εἰ-? or to both, as like the Sanscrit digamma of two *n*s, or double *n*? I suspect so. Then we have a fine analysis into νερθε, νερτερος, and the former may be collated with εἶναι; of very complex accentuation, which can hardly be quite confined to the Infinitive, but must affect εἰμί properly, as we see in second pers. εἶς, and third ἔϛι.

If we *will* not divide the *m*, μ, then, as being too severe a revival, we read ἀμ = εἰμ-; and then αρτ. ηρθ- ἄρω are regular. *Contra*, give the μ to αρτ-, we have the great word μαρτ-υρ, and εἰ, *or* εἰ, = אני, = ἀ-; *i. e.* "though dead, speaking." Again, ἄρηϛ, *Mars*, a "ram," or "young bullock," &c.; *contra*, divide the digamma μ, out of ἀμνος into ἀρνιον, we have a "*lamb*." Compare, in the same fine work, πορεῖν, πιμπρημι, πιμπλημι, for these, and the reason of ρ and λ.

With all collate the Apostle's phrase, "*sold* under sin"; so in another passage, "*come short of*" what was presumed; Gen. iii. 5, &c.; Rom. iii. 23, *lit.* "and are *left behind*," or *last*. These expressions seem fully to bear out the idea of "*missing*" applied to ἁμαρτ; and the truth here stated "for all 'sinned,'" whence ver. 24 follows, assigns our own active participation in the matter. But everywhere "sin" is

represented as *Tyranny*, though the result of seduction; and is personified as a *Tyrant*, and we liable to be his prey.

Most logically does the Apostle work out, as Gen. iii., and the Gospel in parable do, that the agent or agency are foreign to man and alien to God, which has wrought the mischief; and Gen. iv. to Cain, as well as Rom. vii., argue abuse of man, as Rom. viii. 20 does the "creature's subjugation *to* the *fatuity*, or *by* the *fatuity*." But the Gospel, referring to this great subject, says, "An enemy, or *hostile* MAN, hath done this," "sowing tares among the wheat." Now this carries into the great world of "*Spirits*," or "*Souls*," which *include* "*man*," necessarily, to make the former references accord. St. Jude's expression, then, of "*twice* dead," St. James's of διψυχος of "*two*-souled," or "*divided*-souled, man," and St. Paul's illustration at the opening of Rom. vii., on which his argument is based, bring out that *oscillating* which is put a stop to, as ver. 9 states the case. The anarthrous form of νόμος, as distinguished from ὁ νόμος, is highly important; — "for apart from Law sin is dead, νεκρά; I, too, lived apart from Law some while," &c.; that is, I was ἄπειρος, as Heb. v. 13 — "*untried*," marg. '*have no experience*.' Refer to what we said on chap. ii.

Not to meddle with the words, for "death and life," I would recall what I advanced about the Hebrew pronoun-sound, as corroborated too by the Sanscrit; and, seeing what ἐγω, I, here means, I would ask, Has this true pronoun value been seen, where it undoubtedly is entire, in ελεγχ-, *conviction?* The pregnant import of the passage at John xvi. 8 lies in this word; and Heb. xi. 1 considerably expounds it. This may seem to maintain Dr. Jules Müller's view as to '*selfishness*' being "sin"; yet the argument suggests the contrary, even *self-deception;* and that therefore the *exposure of self* is so difficult of accomplish-

ment. Self-respect, or self-love, may in a certain sense be deemed "selfishness," yet in every way this would be distortion of idea, and perversion of truth. But, what is more to my purpose, it would be disguising, forging the truth; counterfeiting and *so* despoiling it. "Shew me a penny. Whose image and superscription hath it?" It is presumed, taken for granted, that the *metal* is genuine; but here lies the whole field of *credit*.

The actually etymology of the Greek word is a wider thesis than even that of the Hebrew; as *the amplifying of the bye-fault*, Rom. v. 20, would lead us to expect at a later age; and so on through Latin and "every man's own tongue," to each man respectively.

That the word is ancient is proved by its use in Homer; but the point is, what did Homer mean by it? It 'governs' the *genitive*.

I have adduced one more instance than is given in the old Oxford πιναξ to the Iliad of this word; and cannot but think that to "*miss*" is the involved idea. I am quite aware that I came to the enquiry with a bias; it is, however, a bias of many years' growth, and only grows stronger. I leave the passages with my old and now last impressions.

Il. δ. 4, 491, τοῦ μεν ἁμαρθ, ὁ δὲ, &c. There is a scholium on this which seems to prove — "*missed*"; οὗτινος διημαρτε μὲν καὶ ἀπὲτυχε. But since the *genitives* always follow this verb, it surely rather means that 'the spear *glanced off* or *from*'; and ἀπετ is *required to fill in* that he "missed," not his *aim*, but his *end*, viz., to kill Ajax.

Il. ι. 9, 487. Here it is intransitive. -ὅτε κέν τις ὑπερβήῃ καί ἁμάρτῃ. For ὑπερβ. the scholium has παρέλθῃ, but not a word about ἁμ. Now here the καὶ makes ἁμ refer to something *beyond* ὑπερβ and παρὰ, that is, *anything but* "missing"; and this seems to be

what St. Paul brings out as occurring upon ἐπὶ- at Rom. vii. This whole Book IX, is avoided generally, but mistakenly so, surely.

Il. ν. 13, 518, ἀλλ' ὄγε γὰρ τόθ' ἁμαρτεν; this complex phraseology seems suggested by the "abiding grudge" that spoiled his *aim of killing* his man. Here, however, τόθ' is accus., not gen.; and perhaps it was rather the *opportunity* which failed, from Idomeneus's "steadily retreating," for the actual βάλε or "he *threw*," did catch Ascelephus. Perhaps Deiphobus rather *brandished* than *hurled* his spear.

Il. ρ. 17, 609 τοῦ μέν ῥ' ἀπὸ τυτθὸν ἅμαρτεν, "From him indeed he *erred* a little bit"; what a lot of words to bring out 'he *missed* him'!

Il. ν. 13, 360, ἀμαρτοεπες; Ajax! *random-talking*, bellowing, "What said'st thou"? Here this can hardly mean *failing* of words, but the contrary, *bragging-worded, braggart-talking*.

Il. χ. 22, 505, φίλου ἀπὸ πατρος ἁμαρτὼν, "*suffer*, or '*miss*,' many things, ἁμ, from a fond father."

Il. ψ. 23, 857, ὄρνιθος ἁμαρτὼν. Here the bird is *hit*, βάλῃ first; then the "maimed, by luck, bird," another archer is said ἁμ., and gets the lesser prize. In neither of these two last cases, can ἁμ. = '*miss*,' &c.

Il. ω. 24, 68, ἡμάρτανε, "since no how [οὔτι] *failed he, missed he, of offering* fond gifts." The idea is, since *offering at all* is recognised, that he did not bring "the halt, or the lame, or the blind"; "did not *swerve from* choice gifts."

Il. κ. 30, 372, "and hurled a spear"; ἐκὼν δ' ἡμάρτανε φωτός. This passage is valuable to compare with Rom. viii. 20, as to ἐκὼν, and that ματαω = ἀμάρτανω. I think in Homer's passage it is "he, intending, grazed

of the mortal," *q. d.* so as to frighten him, and not hit the '*vital parts.*'

I do not meddle with ἡμβροτ in two places.

Leaving these notes for others who may find patience to study them, I go on. Though rough, they have been carefully thought out, but I have not the mind that can *together-think* them. But I have experience enough to warrant me in advising that any man, be he who he may in our day, be very careful how he thinks he can.

I purpose bringing up my thoughts to a close on Gen iv., the first place where the Hebrew word occurs. Remember that at that time "THE *law was put to gratuity-wise*," Gal. iii. 19; for Rom. iv. 15 plainly asserts what the *absence of* "*Law*" means. "*The* law was given by Moses" indeed; but it had been *insinuated* and *insinuating itself* from the time of the expulsion from Eden. There are thus three stages, so to speak; "Law," but not felt by man; the same insinuated and felt "*the* law," but *latent;* the same as *privilege*, "the law given by Moses," *patented.* "Sin" is not incorporated, or incorporating itself in the first case; has its own way naturally in the second case; abruptly and vindictively in the third case. Now this last is the case which all the Mosaic Œconomy had to do with. The counterpoise of that Œconomy is what we now are *privileged* to enjoy, and yet are as free as Israelites were in the times of the Judges so far as God's appointment, Nature's field, and the God Jesus's "grace and truth," can afford and secure it to man. But, strange to say, we do not enjoy these; I question whether any man does who is otherwise than as St. Paul checks himself to describe himself, at 1 Cor. ix. 21, and those he aims to "win."

Now in English Version there is a great misleading idea. It seems to spring from the unintentional detraction from the honour of "the Father," through the undue, though to

us proximate and right, exaltation of "the Son." Though we read in the Prophets — "I will magnify My word above all My name"; yet we also read, "I will magnify My Law and make it honourable." The *loop*-form of *privilege*, and its absorption into the parent "Law" which could afford it, are not enough kept in mind; nor that "*Law*" itself, *now privileged*, can be free.

When we read of our Lord saying, "He that is not with us is against us" (accepting the E. V.), is it not forgotten that *the time when* He said it was the age of Established Privilege? The "*no*" and "*not*" of the Hebrew of Gen. iv. are quite unmistakeable negations and prohibitions; but it is not so since our Blessed Lord's *Pascha*, any more than it was of Gideon, Barak, Sampson, Jephthah, &c. It is marvellous to see what a puzzle there is about Melchisedec; whereas he is even named in Heb. vii., only because he must have been a very *pariah* to the Jews, simply because his name is not in their Registry. "Can any good come out of Galilee?" "They were astonished," &c., Acts x. 45. These are the explanatory phenomena.

Now the conclusion which they jumped at is the same that ruled the Translators for our E. V., and that has ruled all mere officialism; Human Nature cannot carry Divine Honours.

This feeling reigns to this day, although Romanism has contrived to invent a deal of 'venial sins,' 'mortal sins,' and so forth.

When we read of ἀπιστια we jump at once to the terrible ideal we have of '*infidelity*,' to parson, Church, God and man; and therefore excommunicate it as far as Canon Law can. But it is utterly forgotten, apparently, that this rigorous alternative ceased with the Privilege. It does not follow that because right is right, that *left* must be *wrong*. I said above, from "the book of Judges," that those "left-

handed slingers" were terrible fellows and extolled. Left-handed Amazons, to be consistent, should have cut off the left, not the right, breast. So our Lord intimated, "If thy right hand offend thee, cut it off," *and work with your left.* In the wide field of "grace and truth," he *is* best who *does* best; "manners makyth man" among men, but *la politique* of the Christian is not among men.

Now so far as "Law" and "Nature" are concerned, waiving for the present, as all 'naturals' do, the proximate supremacy of "'*grace*,' *not of truth*,' let us go to Gen. iv. The connexion of the story with Gen. iii. is sublime; the birth of the twin-Brothers, their Religion and Ritual, the murder of Abel by Cain, all sublime, profound. But at ver. 5 we read of a preference, which Heb. xi. 4 justifies naturally; 6, "and Cain was wroth very, and his faces fell." Note here excess and depression; and collate the Apostle's ἐπι-θυμία at Rom. vii., quoting "*the* Law." That very *excess* was a παραβασις of even the law of the case, but much more so of "Law."; the *depression* was allied to it by contrast; little did he know the working of the *two as both*, or as being "unto one" issue. God expostulates; "and Jehovah said, Why" *this?* "and Why" *that?* "*Is it not* [*q. d.*, Is not this the rule, Law, condition?] if *thou goodedst, elevation* [*i. e.*, of primo-geniture-privilege]? And if *thou not goodedst, at the door* [*gate*, or *opening thus created*] WRONG *is en couchant, and to thee is Its appetite, and thou shalt* SHALL *in It*"?

That is, priority of birth cannot be changed, but *duties* as well as *rights* belong to it. Aristocracy has been ever associated with "*bravery*" of some kind, a *worthy* and sustained priority. The "SHALL-*ing* of juniors or inferiors may be kept up by domineering force; but was necessary only because "Wrong" or "Sin" had gotten the mastery of the

Elder. Compare the behaviour throughout of Esau and Jacob towards each other.

Now it seems here that the "*not gooding*" *is to be strictly taken;* but that we have no Right whatever to *jump at once to the bad.* It is very true that the *Bad, i. e., Wrong,* is 'all-agape' as *we* are at disappointment of the expected issue; yet we are actually left only at our original *par,* naturally. If from one excess or extreme we swing or are swung to the opposite extreme, that is by virtue of a "law" which underlay the Privilege which motived us to do something extra; which same "Law," now exaggerated by abused privilege, does not drive to murder but by *ab*-use, that is, *dis*-use of it. It is Privilege which cannot tolerate *mis*use; "Law" can take care of itself. Thus to *wrong* a man is very much more than to *deny his rights.* It may be noticed too that one of the ordinary words rendered "sin" is רע, = "*wrong,*" in a present mixed Greek and Portuguese-Hebrew pronunciation.

It is a maxim that such 'confusion' of Languages as I have been exhibiting is to be forbidden. Yet when I believe that this most wonderful Book has been written and conserved for the use of *all men* to their "profit," I question the prohibition as to *this* Book. It may be that like Shakespeare's lacquey, "having been at a feast of languages I have stolen the scraps"; but really such "scraps" are very savoury. What must the "feast" have been?

'Fashions change' in the world, in all things that man has to do with; but there is a *substratum* in all things which he cannot change. He may alter their garb, and mode of 'cooking,' and by the very persistence of elementaries commute, transmute, by χημι, 'chemistry,' their every habitude; but a knowing chemist can cause an exegesis of all.

The Dialectic varieties of the Greek are peculiarly valuable, as helping us to the true values of the 'received text'

of Scripture; but their vulgarities or 'profanities' are ignored there. It is surely probable that many Semitic Dialects contain information of high value though they be Peçthito or Peçchito, rude and 'corrupt' in the *sanct.* or *sacer*-dotal eye; in fact, *Demotic*. So with the now called San-scrit, the Greek and Latin particular were once its Demotic. So with the Latin, the Provençals were once its Demotic. So doubtless with all languages. Yet for all that, indeed because of that, one must see the probability that the Bible is right when it says we were once "all of one *lip*." It seems not noted that this very word *lip*, *lab*-i-um, may be the very same word as *lingua*, λαβ, לב = "*heart*"; signifying not only the way we *say* or *give* a thing, but also the way we '*take*' the same; and then what is the *luck*, λαχ, of the thing itself? So that perhaps at Babel the proof was *quarrel*, owing in the profound to "confounding of *heart*," as source of "confusion of lip and tongue."

But though *cor*-di in Latin = "*heart*," it seems, and is allowed, *this* is not καρ-δι in the *profane*, any more than λαβ, *labi*, in the *open*; the *mean* of both is the Latin *car*-din, *i. e.*, the *modiolus* of the *hinge* on which both turned. And this changeability of the vowel is prefigured in Hebrew as to א, י, and ע, or *ng*. One must be struck with the *ng*-sound in so many African, Chinese, and other languages; it is digammatic. Thus it is that, as William of Wykeham said, '*Manners makyth man.*' But so too is it that *manners cheateth man*. There is no question but that "wisdom of God is in mystery, the vailed away wisdom," and language is "the vail"; for the Sophi, "the key of recognition" is in His hands, not man's. The Jews handled that key for centuries, as the Egyptians or *Ham*-ites [= "Kenites"] and then the *Pharsites* [Pharisees] had done before; and the Greeks for a short time after (some 1,000 years though per-

haps?), Roman Latin for another 1,000, Romish Latin for near another 1,000, and where are we? Through all these years, though the Elijahs knew it not, there have been doubtless "reserved" *thousands*, "who have not bowed the knee to Baal," and yet were "infidels" to "the Keys"! The *Protestant* turn of Europe and Britain has now run about "three years and one half"; is it to run out, and devolve the final Honour on the then unknown America or Columbia? No doubt each nationality has "preached" like Paul in its turn; but how few have *lived* like Paul and "walked"! Have 'establishment' and 'endowment' aught damaging about them, because the man has not arisen since the Knoxes, Luthers, Erasmuses, and so forth, and the Cromwells, who did 'carry corn,' are extinct?

I close this excursus for the present with Prov. viii, 22, 23, where *Solomon*, no less, the *acmé* for our Lord's comparison with "a Lily," writes about Wisdom, חכמה, (ἡ σοφια, LXX. quite unwarrantably as to the article); this is allowedly St. John's ὁ λογος, "The Word"; but in respect of the article see his first Ep. i. 1, 2. This whole chap. of Prov. is sublime; but I limit myself to these two verses.

The LXX. is thus: "Jehovah ἔκτισε με *q. d., excreted, ex-tis'd* me Prime [fertile, αρχη, ראשׁע] of Ways of His unto Works of His, before the *Æon* He foundationed me," &c.

The Hebrew, with phonetic admixture, is thus: "Jehovah *quenned, quinned* me Prime [*fertile*] of ways of His, דרכו, [? *of Thine*?] vis-a-vis, or *subter*, deeds [*follies*?] of thine from that moment [? קאז]. From Æon, קעולם, *I had anointing, anointment*," LXX., but were it as usual it would be, *He anointed me*. Now this last word, fully written out in Hebrew, נסכתי, is *sang-chong-thong 'd me*. Compare '*Sanchoniatho*.'

Why do I write thus? To ridicule the Bible. God Almighty forbid! Yet undoubtedly to temper Prelacy.

There are doubtless many dignified men — dignified by acquired Learning and true Wisdom as well as by Promotion — whose heads, aye and hearts, are teeming with thoughts to which these are puerilities; yet they think "we cannot bear them now." I beseech them to think whether it be *we* that cannot bear, or *they* that cannot carry them now? Also, Who is the ראש, as well as ראשית *now?* Are such studies to be ever vilified as Sancho-Panzaism and Don Quixotism, names which some must know to be the very same as we have handled as *words*. Are all the Samsons and Cervanteses and Butlers and Swifts and Sternes and John Bunyans to write for nought? The Loyolas and Savonarolas and first Mendicants *meant* more and better than the Ἀρεῖοι did. The question was asked in high places, when it was urged there, — "What is '*Prestige*'"?

Section 8.

Rough Summary.

The remainder of this Paper is given because I think I ought not to suppress it. They are the first off-throws of my Thoughts when I began, and I leave them nearly as first written; for were I to rewrite I should never have done.

And now what the *Bath?* John says μετανοίας. Granting that *ια* is our etymon, we are not therefore to conclude that *νο*, as the other is complete. Taking it so, nothing is more likely than that it is a form after the fashion of νομος, λογος, &c., from a perf. midd. of νεω, νεύσομαι; that, therefore, it means a *float*, then a *swimmer*. Unless we imagine something of this sort (like the fœtus in the Liq. Amnii, or the chick in the yelk, &c.), we do not conceive the idea of mere Mind, nor of Jonah just being thrown overboard and falling. This then exhibits Mind in two ways, as *νο-*; first,

the float afloat, adrift, or as John's "baptism," immersed, &c.; but, secondly, as a sea itself when developed into which things drift and float there. So the mind may be contaminated by the things drifting there before Imagination even apprehends them. Thus mind, νοῦς, is not only a receptacle, nor *only* an obstacle or bound, but a tentacle; not only a sphere or province, but an organ, a faculty.

But suppose that the prefixed ν be but a prefix, and even but a negative, as in ν-ηπιος, for the Ionic is κοέω, as if a *queer* sort of thing; we then have ν-οϝ, ν-οῦ (?) the negative or denial of *q. d.* complete *of*, or οῦ; an advance upon the Ionic query. Being, on the other hand (as in Hebrew), a formative, as if 'take it for what it is worth,' that is, concreting this indefinite, puny, or otherwise vague vagrant; this would account for the masculine form of its suffix νοϝ-ος, νοῦς; for there is no disputing its *quasi* personality.

Whether we understand what we mean there or not, we must agree to call it *Mind;* which as a verb, in English commonly means *to mind*, that is, to *think attentively, intently*, to *think about* as if *memory* were involved; but generally to *think*. This again not merely to *think* as the result of *opinion* or *seeming* which is δοκέω, which however may be nearer akin (in Ionic mind) than we imagine.

This is so important a faculty as we deem it, though we seem to see its dawn in a babe, that such philological speculations are not ridiculous. For, if our premisses have seemed sound, we must accord this same faculty to *animals* as one of the elements of their 'instinct,' in their different measures of comprehension or continence; man's measure being the largest perhaps, but because unguarded by instinct and content, most liable to distraction. I assert this not merely as a squabble about different words or names from what others adopt for the same thing. The great point is to keep it distinct from λογος, '*reason*.' Thus it is from the *scale*

of Human Mind that we read Heb. xi. 3; not as E. V. "we *understand*," still less 'we *re*member, or opine'; but "we *mind*," we *think* — a very *notion*. For without "the belief" of any animal, nay, "of a grain of mustard seed," we would not even "*think*" this as *mind* should "mind" or *think* it; because the subject matter is one we can form no notional opinion thereupon worth a doit that is appreciable by "*mind*," much less "understand." Yet while animals instinctively act as if they did *mind* it, we can "by belief think" it in reason as well as instinct. We do not half revere, as we ought, the rich endowments or attributes of Nature, and among all others of Human Nature. Who duly thinks of the prices paid for his beef and mutton, in other coin than gold and silver?

If strict uniformity in translation of these word-names of Scripture were adopted, this last proposition should, I am persuaded, be less startling than it is likely to be.

Taking *νοf* with the above meaning, we get *νοί*, *νοfί* (comp. *σοφί-α*), as the *attributive faculty* of *νοf*. We can hardly render it *thought* properly; but rather as *thinking in operation* before the *formed thought*, *νοημα*, is announced. Prefix *μετὰ*, and we get '*plunged deep in thinking*,' '*absorbed in thinking*,' and like familiar phrases. But we get more, even in *the midst of thinking*, all-engaged, and engaging all, as it were; for I am persuaded it is erroneous to render it '*after*-thought,' or even, if I mistake not about *trans*, '*change* of thought.' The idea of *μετὰ*, here at least, is rather *intense*, *intimate thinking* — *in the thick of thinking thoughts* — but yet, *with simplicity*.

Again, we must not confuse this single idea by bringing in such a faculty as *φρην*, *Intelligence*; for mind can pass man's understanding. But we must keep to John's word; for *φρονημα*, at least "of flesh, is enmity" to any but *self*; and as for *εἰδ-* the sensuous, it is apt to lead us to idolatry.

However we may read that grandest of poems, Gen. i., as to the word תהום, "the deep," E. V., as distinct from "the waters," yet the infinity almost of the former is in strong contrast with "the waters" which are "held in the hollow of His hand," even God's hand. Whether our word *ocean*, as distinguished from *sea*, be identical with our word *of* = *oq*, *ox*? Who can tell?

The old 'North American Indian' seemed to think so. As that whereas the Israelites said "*Manna?*" common sense said "Take, eat." The writer of Genesis majestically, as Adam had done before him, "calls the name," of which ו is the great etymon, and "that is the name thereof." We know from verse after verse in this very chapter that this is *the great copula* between event and event, whereas *now* μετὰ is the desideratum. I have no hesitation in reading this with, I believe, St. Paul, that "darkness was upon the face of the deep—the abyss, *aloft*—the *Ocean*, *aloft*—*space*, the *mind;*" and that something like this relatively was the state to which man was again "subjugated," by his expulsion from Eden; and is so still until God says, "*Light be.*" That this very copula now as giving place to μετα, in fact is *pre-rogative*. Is it possible—I give the suggestion, for I waive the pursuit—to suppose φρην to the animal ψυχη, is what *νοfς* is to the human ψυχη?—IF humanity were as genuine thoroughly, as are "the animals that perish"?

Being so, then, *νοfς* being both *datum* and *postulate*, a mediterranean *Ocean* between two continents, *into* or *in*, or *upon*, which φρην and εἰδησις float as it were adrift, *apart from* its respondent to these imaginings, both and all of which enter into the complex Organon which we now know of and call "mind," but which strictly is the pure Thinking Faculty,—being so, have we approached the idea of *pure Thought?*—*mere Thought?* Hardly. St. Augustine works hard at it, when he, as Paul before him, wrestled with it

under the name and idea of '*will*,' θέλω; and as he says, was "very near, and all but got hold of it;" but, it "slipped by him," or he by it: (Heb. ii. 1.) And the fact is that unless we sensibly lose our footing, like poor Jonah, and lose all sense, or *sentience*, but "con-science," we cannot be said to be in the *Ocean* of pure Thought, mere Mind. It is in the *approach to* this that, as doubtless with Jonah, that *deliquium animi* occurs, so that "whether in the body or whether out of the body, we cannot tell," *know*; where and when that "*Bath of sweat*," of ὑδατος, comes on which is a very Flood and Deluge to Self; and if a "*Noe*" or *we* survive, we are no more a mere I, but *each* a *we*, like 'the whale + Jonah,' before 'Jonah – the whale' was the ταξις. The very idea of Βαπτισμα, *a having been bathed* in such a process, shews what an *Ocean* "mind" is regarded as being, and still more *Thought* which is the Realm of mind. It is this crucial state of being and non-being which St. Paul, in the above named passage of Eph. iv., names "having-learned the Christ;" but it may be long before one reaches this state. Jonah's wondering yet self-possessed being "in the whale's belly" lasted but for three days, during which that profound experience was acquired which his '*avowal*'—"prayer"—exhibits to us; yet that was enough, by all reason, to warrant Paul's view of such cases as "baptism *unto death*"; where again the old personal I is supplanted by a possessive or oblique *me*, "no longer I." It is thus that a Paul cuts through the difficulties of the analysis, by cutting off all pleas, pretexts and resources. And *can* we be thus consciously stripped and yet consciously *be*? This is just *the* problem.

St. Matthew interprets John's "heralding" differently from the other Evangelists; he writes — "heralding and λεγων, μετανοειτε, for the reign of the heavens has drawn near;" as if it were previously absent, and therefore "until

John, suffered violence," &c.; and that not until afterwards was it correct to say that "the reign of the heaven is *within, inmost of*, you. Reading St. John's record, however, of the great conversation with Nicodemus, it seems probable that we get a wrong view of the case from St. Matthew's interpretation of John's "heralding." Still perhaps Dr. Vaughan will by many be thought to go too far, as when he, in '*Good Words*' for January, 1868, interprets such a process as this of John iii. as earthy, or "earthly." Yet it was to a *master* not a *common man* in Israel that our Lord calls this process and its correspondent, τὰ ἐπιγεία, "*things which transpire on earth*"; and because there is an "ἐντος of us," an "*intimost of us*" who are upon earth, which is the realm of the God." His Essay takes another turn in another direction as he represents it; but has even he, Dr. V., seen that his *alto* has its exact *basso* in this our sphere; and that they are *copulated* unto the issue of a *fuora di basso*, as there has been a *fuora di alto*, in a higher sphere? St. Paul's great analytical term is καταλλαγη; and as *in alto* he speaks (Phil. ii. 7) of it as a having "emptied Himself," its correspondent with us, since we can hardly actively empty ourselves, will be that we may *be* consentiently, passively *emptied* of ourselves; and that, often gradually, is this gradual and finally thorough *otherwis-ation*, or *alteration of our-Self-s*. He has not shrunk from, not only carrying out for his own mind, but also writing out for the good of the Gentiles, this great analytic; and that it may still be profitably studied by Dogmatists, I firmly believe. These things do, as Dr. Vaughan urges, take *place upon earth;*" for "it is the last time."

And let not those who are jealous of Human pretensions and object to such views forget the profound argument of Paul at Rom. viii. 19, &c. He there expressly says that the κτισις, or *Creation*, which must include man, "was subjected

to, or subjugated by, the fatuity οὐκ ἑκοῦσα, *not spontaneous*"; it is not οὐκ ἑκουσίως, *not spontaneously*, "not *willingly*." The "fatuity" *to* or *by* which it "was subjugated" is *disease, acquired*, not native; so that the disease being *removed*, the man being thus *cured*, resiles of its own accord, *naturally*, not to say natively. If, Rom. vii. 8, through "the law" *as privilege*, "the sin [*q. d.* the disease] can take or get ἀφορμη, a *spring* or *'vantage*, through the ἐντολη, or *instinct? impulse?* or *intimate lien*" of us, surely medicine, or remedy, may by "Law" claim equal or like 'vantage at *par*. Now the business of the Gospel according to St. Paul, and that by "the Law" too (Gal. iii. iv.), is just to bring about this *par*, which is far beyond the summary which John "heralded," and yet far short of, and indeed other than, the initiative, which the Big *Spirit* superinduces thereupon. But still *the Nature* remains; so that St. Paul expresses his meaning at 2 Cor. v. 4, as the expected issue. There seems great danger on either hand in our failing to "keep the analogy of the belief"; perhaps History would shew it as great in Ecclesiastical "lording it" over Humanity, as in Human indifference, disgust and beggary.

In reading our text of John, as Mark and Luke give it, in E. V. we are misled in a way which the Greek avoids. It reads, just as the Romish church has exaggerated, as if "repentance" wrought "remission of sins"; not only by rendering εἰς "*for*," instead of *into* or *unto* as the issue, but ignoring βαπτισμα, which implies *duration* of the process and the *condition*. The "repentance" — rather, intense, intimate *Thought*, is indeed the menstruum of the *Bath;* but unless thus collected, concentrated so as to afford a Bath, all Thought were as unavailing to such issue as it is vague and indefinite. That *Thought* can procure a *Bath* — even of "*sweat*," or "water," will be conceived not impossible by many of us; but that it should be so intense or so enduring,

as is here urged on us by John, not many realise naturally until the beneficial issue is not doubtful. We are not at liberty to alter terms, however, on that account, any more than we would determine doubtful issues, as if we be judges. When *Nature* is fairly at extremity, who of us shall *reason* about it? On the other hand we must not confine our idea of death or of life, to what we observe as natural physical phenomena; we know that there are conditions other than these, yet like, to which Scripture annexes these same terms. We may speak of *virtually* dead, *virtually* alive, in poetic language as we do of other qualities; but Scripture is *taken* to mean things real, when it speaks of things or persons *spiritually* so. How far this is accurate, how far quasi metaphorical may be questioned. But at any rate that the effect of such *Bath of midthought* should be commensurate with, or issue into "dismissal of sins," *cancelling*, *i. e.*, or *discharge* of them *justi-ly*, even *our* Reason being judge; St. Paul expresses it in quite equivalent terms at Rom. vi. 7, only, however, in a participial and causal manner; ὁ ἀποθανὼν δεδ. — "*one having died away is justied, rightied,* from the sin," is past the *crisis*. The strict logic hinges on ἀποθαν-; and we cannot but regard the express terms of ver. 6, which introduces the conclusion there "for" which this ver. 7 is introduced, as explanatory: those terms are "if con-natural We have come to be by the similitude of His death, &c." The next clause to this needs not repetition of the word "similitude" because the verb is future—"*we shall be;*" and yet it seems implied; but the whole scheme of the argument rests on that fact which v. 1, 2, pronounced to be attainable, and which is *an Is* TO BE, satisfactory to the end. It is true we cannot at all appreciate the value or even the being of an individuality arrived at such a pass as that of a satisfactory exhaustion of self, a having died away, a being rightied, justied; yet by the terms *consciousness*, συνειδησις, and

"*belief*" πιστις, St. Paul urges and maintains the postulate of *continuance of being*, but in a *subjective condition*, expressed by the objective case; Gal. ii. 19–21. This primal condition or case and the relief from it are powerfully depicted at Ezek. xvi. 1—14; and the order of succession is amply marked. There is a stage of a quasi *non-entity*; grant that it be no more than what St. Paul twice or thrice speaks of as μὴ ὀντος, "*scarcely being*," yet it is not οὐ ὀντος '*not* being.'

It is true, however, that such effect as is producible by the law of privilege is not to be claimed as the effect of only law of nature, though it must be based upon *this* "law"; there is just this difference to be maintained in the study of St. Paul's arguments about "Law," and "the Law." So where the one ends and the other begins, or where the *loop*-law issues from the *main* law and comes round to coalesce again, we may vainly try to discover; but the effect desiderated, that of self-exhaustion, but especially of self-sacrifice, is always brought about by a contrast which overwhelms us. *Before* the contrast is realised however, *before* that καταλλαγη is effected, there is that non-descript condition of "scarcely being" which John, as the herald of the sum of the law of privilege, designates by the name "*Baptism*," but specially as a "*Baptism of mid-Thought*," a *quasi* 'blank' condition. Of course it is there that the miraculous and the mysterious are at work; yet are they not equally so in every moment of our natural being? We bring in for instance the history of Jonah on his voyage to Tarsus because all is there vividly depicted and detailed; yet has not the like in measure as fatally occurred to every Christian? Has any one otherwise "learned the Christ"? Have we not it as a very proverb, that, 'man's extremity is God's opportunity'? And is not that extremity just that which John *heralded*? Did not his *practice* too, as in Naaman's case, procure a state of *negation*

—a "going away of sins," or of "leprosy"; and if this be *cure*, is it not legally "*death*" in some form or mode? John "baptizes in water" *to wash away, q. d. impedimenta,* because "the reign of the heavens is at hand"; and if *cure* of Naaman thereby ensue thereupon, and a life, a revival or survival to the Christian thereby again ensue thereupon, we would at best produce a par. And so St. Paul brings out and affirms that one and the same substantive condition, nay ὑποστασις or *substature, substasis,* is the link or copula, equally or similarly identifying both cases. Now room for the miraculous here is abundantly seen, it was throughout predicable, reliable, and that of nature, as argued Rom. viii. 19; we have it here described as 'the deep' or 'abyss,' or *Ocean* in such a way as that it may mean the vault '*of heaven,*'—open space, which we above appropriated to "mind"; and it is added "and the Spirit of God hovered OVER the waters." Here it is clear, however, that some ancient notions of Cosmogony jar with our own notwithstanding; or else we misinterpret them, which is far more probable. The way to reconcile is to remember, as Noah too read facts, that there was a vast ocean of waters *above* "the firmament," whence the Tropical "rains descended," as well as below; and then we must understand this of "Spirit—hovered over the face of the upper waters."

Now then see our Lord's figurative language; "unless one be born [or *be begun*] ἀνωθεν, from upwards [whence Light came when bidden] he cannot see, ἰδεῖν, *have idea of,* the realm of heaven." Again; "unless one be begun again ["*born*"] of water, sweat, and of πνεῦμα, *what has been breathed,* or *blown,* [as by the "hovering spirit of God"] he cannot have entered into the realm of the *Thou.*" Be it observed that in the oblique cases of ὑδωρ, *sudor,* we have apparently in ὑδατ- a precise parallel to πνευματ-, as if both are equally perf. part. pass.-termination. Thus as "*water,*"

as '*rain*,' *wet*, or as "*sweat*," they are equally *ex-sudations* from their respective sources—the "brow" of Adam, the front of the sky. Thus too conversely Earth and all its cosmic arrangements in Gen. i. being granted, we have in ch. ii., its fertility ascribed to the "mist" or dew which "*went up*" &c. A mutual action of ascending and descending are recognised, of which Earth is the beneficiary. One had need to go carefully through the third chap. even to its last verse, and even as expounded in Rom. v. in the case of "*man*," before we hastily assent to an interruption of the course of nature. I feel certain that great errors have been induced by the rendering the so careful verbals in τ-ος every where, as if they were synonymous with the Lat. perf.-participles in -*tus*. They indicate, *always*, probabilities not certainties, postulates not axioms. But I have treated of this elsewhere.

In the great passage of John iii., by rendering the word γενν-"*born*," we introduce a figure stronger than Paul's terms, κτίσις, παλιγγενεσία, appear to support, even if we take into note the embryonic state, as a state of being also. No doubt there is a stage, or an almost non-stage, a μὴ οὖσα, which only one who has experienced *and passed it* can imagine. But the figures here employed, "sweat and spirit," are exactly such as we observe in the condition (say, of fire) of *deliquium* or *going out*, and of *revival*, as by fanning or blowing,—or rather, *what has been blown*. We see it exactly pourtrayed in Gen. ii. as compared with Gen. i. (which is no mere expletory repetition, but rather an iteration under new circumstances) — "breathed into his nostrils breath of lives," E. V.; it is a re-*animus*-ing, not a *reanimating*, surely, of the 'fallen' man. But however this be, "the spirit" is an infectant, *q. d.* which effectuates a revival of *animus* in the deliquient or relictuary "baptized" man, which virtually is a *being begun again;* and at the same time is a *beginning again*, though hardly to be called so consciously;

yet after the manner of the operation of the ganglionic functions in the animal organism, ἐν βρέφῃ. Further, unless that "*sweating*" experience have been all but absolutely *critical* (for "he does not come into crisis"), and relatively quite critical, he cannot have been exhausted so far as to be said to revive, or be begun again.

But this is exactly what John urges; whether it be the βαπτ. or the μεταν, or both, they are to endure εἰς "*unto* or *into*, ἀφ, ἀμ, discharge of sins." That this can only be initiated, and then secretly progressive, we conclude from 1 John i. 8; and yet the stage of "*having been begun again*," iii. 9, is most overwhelmingly characterized. So then this is a stage and condition *annexed to* that "way of Jehovah" which John "heralded and got ready," and which he calls "*Baptism*," as the effect of *deep, profound* "mid-thought," an *ascertaining* of the "what *mean* ye by this service?"

Carefully note that this is an annex to John's *practice*. For, whereas he "baptizes *in* water" for the purpose of recognizing or "having wisted" "the Christ," "the Lamb of the God," this passage speaks, not only of κτισις, not only of παλιγγενεσία or *re-genesis* — a state indefinitely prolonged, as at Gen. i. 1, 2, &c. — but of a "being born, ἀνωθεν, *q. d. antecedently*, or ἐξ ὑδατος, out of sweat and spirit," the former of which the *mater* "knows" better than the babe, the babe "wists" better than the mother; while the word υἱος unites *both in one*, though temporarily or casually "twain." There is less of prodigality in this last physical supposition than there is in the dogmatic conclusion about the doctrine of "*baptism*." The force of parental instinct is the highest natural simile adopted in the Bible; and we may suppose filial ingratitude the lowest. These rest on natural law. But when we talk of the originals of these similes we are in a realm that we "*know*" nothing about.

We have here arrived at a conclusion which certainly seems to be at variance with our current and propounded views of Baptism. It is plain that from the *terms* of our Articles 25, 26, 27, but more especially still from the Catechism, that what we must call *the ideal* [εἶδος] is the patent part of 'the office,' as distinguished from the latent. A careful regard, however, to this and two other *terms* of St. Paul, seems capable of fairly qualifying this view. That the "outward and visible sign," "whereby as by an instrument" *opus operatum est, vel sit,* is the "water" is plainly stated. This was John's "instrument" also in the Jordan; that is, it was the *sensible,* or visible, audible, handleable material with, or by means of, which all that we have found imported in the metaphor of *βαπτω, ἅπτω,* &c., were to flow into us. The whole Levitical ritual was precisely and exactly homæologous; it was a system literally of Ideolatry in a perfectly legitimate and easily appreciable machinery, which was not "*Idol*atry," though *Ideol*atry. I am persuaded that this distinction is as important as it is true, just, and logical, and Biblical. Yet notwithstanding the Apostle John's warning against the former — "the Idols," 1 John v. *ult.*, the Romish Church has *Idol*ized the water as much as "the Host,' which the British has not yet *formally* done. And this is just what the Pagan world did, not a whit less; as of course the *vulgus* or commonalty is as "*apt*" as they were, *to do,* whatever different *meaning* the Priests may profess to believe. This "*aptitude*" is, as we have seen, a most beautiful and natural feature of our constitution, but therefore the most salient for abusive influence. Upon and by means of this it is that *impressions* producible by the Idols affect us; but these *impressions of* or *from* the *Idols* [εἴδεος, εἰδοῦς] are not to be confounded with the very *Idols* [εἶδος, εἰδῆ] from whence they proceeded. Our *senses* are affectible by the *Idols,* because affinitated; thus there may follow,

hurt, pain, injury, as well as *pleasure, good;* and these are all tangible, palpable. But the affections or infections which result from the *impressions* also derived of or from the *Solids* which afforded them, are *consequences* of both the *sensation* and the *Idol* which was exegetic towards their production. Moreover these latter are resultants by natural *law* in natural men, and are therefore inevitable. Not so with the former; because the Idol may be so avoided as that Law becomes inoperative. In fact, there is as good as *no law,* for there is *no case.*

While, therefore, "we know that nothing *is* an Idol, ἐν κόσμῳ, in a world," because such "world" has its Law-in-common, and that, by reason of such *common generalization,* "nothing" is to be so isolated as to be regarded *per se* which would render it *exceptional,* yet we also observe by scrutiny that the *general* is really made up of *particulars.* And though the whole world, *as a whole,* may be an Idol, no *part of that whole* can be logically so regarded. The nearest approach is that such part is *Ideol;* but then absolutely it is *exceptional.* So much for the *thing;* now its '*latria.*'

The word "world" has a good many senses. By St. James, of "the tongue," and especially by St. John, as if of "the fashion," it seems to have a restricted sense, which people can "worship" or 'do service to,' on the presumption that they know their master. But in the passage of St. Paul above it is unquestionably used in the largest sense; so large that he states his proposition as a very axiom; *cosmolatry* in this sense being unheard of; for the "stars" were not deemed "worlds." Yet almost each and every 'element' of the world has been — the Jews say *Idolized;* but *we* think rather *Ideolized.* The danger, however, even of the latter, as by force of law, from the aptitude of man to it is so great, that although such was Divinely adopted and adapted for the

Jews it was under terrific Law, called "The Law." Now this was '*Statute* Law.' This having so to speak its zenith with Moses, has its nadir in John; the first as to its institution, the last as to its profound interpretation.

Now of this, "the Law," it is that St. Paul writes, as "having the shadow — of *things* on the very verge or point of being profits, *goods*." We miss much here if we do not make μελλω import, as it does, a very moment between *this* moment and *the very next* moment, scarcely to be called 'future'; just as the aorist means a like moment between the *just passing* or *all but past*, yet *not* past. Its main root is με-λ, the same as in με-τ; and in this literal sense may be regarded as if the Hebrew *schva* momented or concreted. We have seen that though "nothing is an idol in a world"; yet it may have εἰδῇ *i. e.*, εἰδεῇ, which are abundantly suggestive; and also that these suggestions must be *lawed* by their parent. So then the Law itself becomes not only suggested but supposable *ab extra*. For as every solid must be deemed a parent of its own "shadow," the *solid* "possesses" the shadow we must suppose, whether it cast it on the ground or not; that is, such a proposition is supposable. It is just in this fashion that St. Paul lays it down; for he does not say *has* or *possesses*, but, "the Law having," or possessing; that is, *supposing* it to be so, allowing it, taking it for granted. Thus it is that this master of analysis throws it all upon 'credit,' "belief," as before to Peter, &c. Be it *granted* then "the Law given by Moses" and interpreted by John *has* or *possesses* "shadow" — not *the*, nor "*a* shadow" — What then? At the very furthest it is but a *postulate* granted.

But he goes further here; he says "not *having* the image of the facts." Here is a marvellous statement for the ritualist! Why the facts, — these "the upon-earthy, visible, audible, tangible, palpable *things* are the very machinery of

"the Law"; yet it has not "the image" then "of *the facts*," though it "haply, or participially, have *the shadow of the forthcoming profits* or *goods*." (See Rom. v. 7, and Gal. iii. 5, in another suit.) What then was the proper field of operation for this "shadow," which is not "the image" of even "the facts"? Undoubtedly — *Thought*, as John the Baptist's phrase ultimately resolved it to; but *μετα-thought;* that is, relatively to the thinker, *terminal*, *finial* thought; but also absolutely, "*mid*-thought," where the thinker *loses his foothold*. We have supposed that to be found in the "Bathedment of Sweat"; suppose, further, it lasts not only like Jonah's "three days and three nights" of durance; at all events, a *βαθος* of *time* as well as place.

Now it is in this profound of Thought — rather of *mind*, the organ of Thought — that another field of operation is laid bare for other Influences; and that, though we cannot divine it even before we arrive at the "*heart*" and the '*affections*'; — it is "the Chamber of Imagery," the working of the *Imagination* by the "images" of "facts." This Faculty may be readily surmised separately, even from the very "*letter*" of Script. in *τῇ διανοίᾳ*.

We attempted above the etymology of *νοῦς*, and arrived at *νοf*. Now this *f* seems to be the *σ*, or its lieutenant, in *γνωσκω*, *γιγνωσκω*, *nosco*, *novi*, *nôtum* for *novitum*, — to *know*, *i. e.*, *knoff*. Without meddling with the *γ*, reduplicated even as it is, we may say that to *know* will be understood as differing from to *wit*, *wist*, *wot*, as con-*naistre* from *Sçavoir;* in both which the sibilant resides. We mean *mind*-knowledge, as if the intrinsic "fruit" of Thought, as distinct from *sense*-knowledge, which must be extrinsically derived. We readily suppose that the latter can be '*ex-parte*,' very partial indeed, even limited to the point of contact; we shall not so promptly concede that the former must be similarly limited in its wider sphere. Yet so it is; for

St. Paul talks to Timothy of a "falsely-called γνῶσις or *knowledge;* but no where does he hint at εἰδησις or '*science*' being false, nor falsely so called; only he says "we do not walk δι' εἰδοῦς," that is, by the *parent* of that 'science.'

Suppose then we say of γνῶσις, "knowledge," that though ἀπὸ μέρους, or *partial* too, it yet reach the half of a subject; what about the other half? It is purely the subject of *imagination*, in the proper sense of this term. Our words *imaginary, imaginative, &c.*, have unhappily become twisted from their true meaning; but they contain the very word which St. Paul here uses. A short time ago King James used it in the other extreme; so that 'Iconoclasts' have become synonymous with Idoloclasts.

It is hard to say whether the final etymon of *vof* be in the word εἰκον- or not. It is possible that the κ is the consonantal power of the digamma, though our Grammarians write *ϝεικων*. That some radical of *vof* is in εἰκονα (for this is St. Paul's form and case) one would expect, inasmuch as they, or at least γνο-, are cognate Faculties. I could even suppose from Gen. vi. 5, *marg.*, that διανοία is the Scripture name for this Faculty, only that it reads διανοεῖται ἐν τῇ καρδια, LXX. The verb שבה, of which Ezechiel uses the noun, signifies a *roamer* or *roaming*, than which a more suitable word for the idea could hardly be found; '*chamber of the roaming one*'; comp. Job. i. 7, ii. 2; and St. Paul's φρονημα σαρκος. Only, mind, εἰκων, *image*, differs from εἶδος, and from μορφη, *forma*. Shall we understand by "image" an *Image of the meaning?* For this is what it seems to amount to here, "having not an *Image of the meaning* of the facts," though "haply a shadow of the forthcoming goods."

Now if the "shadow" be gone with the *substance*, as our Bible testifies He is, "for He is τελος νομου," what remains different from the "very *Image*," as distinct from the 'memorial,' "of the facts"? An "image" is an *impression*,

χαρακτηρ, of the *past*, as *basso-relievo* to *alto-relievo* — or, indeed, as *vice-versa*. And if the *matrix* be personified as the vehicle of the *impression* or "*image*," and by reason, or by means thereof, such personality is in Paul's words, καίνη κτισις, "a new 'colonia,' or creature," out of the parent estate; a very παλιγγενεσία, or *beginning again*, implying therefore a "*having been begun*," ἀνωθεν, — adds our Lord to Nicodemus. This afterwards He seems to interpret by εκ πνεύματος, "of spirit," the רוח or "wind of God," of Gen. i. 2, as distinguished from the "*water*," or *sweat*, which was the vestibule, or καταλυμα.

Thus first *undone* then, or *dissolved*, — for it is a virtual "death," — Humanity lies open through the same διανοια, or novel νοῦς, or "newness of mind," to the influences proper and peculiar to the freed "heart" and "affections" in lieu of "passions," — "belief, hope, love." But this is far beyond the reach or scope of him who accosted us with "O offsprungs of vipers!" The very logical and natural necessity of some such series as this seems inferrible from St. Paul's questions, &c. *E. g.*, "Into what then were you baptized?" Acts xix. 3. "Having been begun or initiated by spirit, will ye now — are ye now going to, be finished off *by* flesh?" And above all, "I thank God I baptized none of you save Crispus, &c., lest ye should say I baptized into mine own name." Already it should seem, that "baptism" was deemed more a "way" *into* than a "way" *out of* a condition. Has it been duly observed, moreover, that, except in plain reference to John the Baptist, the Gospel and Epistles of John do not contain the word βαπτ. any where? That nothing like Mark xvi. 16, and Matt. xxviii. 19, occurs, neither in Luke nor elsewhere? That therefore, while the remaining "eleven" (Gal. ii. 9 includes John with James and Peter) carry on the old machinery and the young Church has carried it on for eighteen centuries, Paul who was miraculously "called"

from heaven (not as the eleven, from earth) for his mission to the Gentiles, is he who almost repudiates such an office? — though he reminds Timothy of the "imposition of my hands"? — just as he also circumcised him, and yet not Titus? He surely laboured to "shew a more excellent way." Because "he is not a Jew who is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh." *

There still, however, are two main considerations. John's severe demand is, "Who 'warned' you [or, *did any one 'warn' you?*] to flee from the forth-coming 'wrath'?" The

* In reading 'Ecce Homo,' and Mr. Gladstone's generous and able review of it in 'Good Words' (No. for March), one is struck with the assertions about the 'indispensableness of Baptism.' Be it so to the utmost extent; but if we here are right in our idea of the *end* of Baptism, even the exhaustion of *the Subject* of the Law, what does this amount to but to that which in Logic and Mathematics is allowed to be so, all but impossible — *the proving of a negation?* Now in the Christian scheme, the mortal, fatal, vital proof of this is the very threshold; a postulate, the grant of which should be so much a matter of memory that it has grown up into an *axiom — a thing of course.* Heb. iii. 14. Here the thought strikes me as probable that Paul, our great analyst, did not stop at so purely scholastic and even religious a thesis as this, as the other, the Judæan, Apostles did, but as our Lord does, at John v. 24, when he states that "the believer in Him does not come into crisis, yet *must* have wended through the midst," *q. d.* as David says, "through *the valley of the shadow* of death," "out of the death into the life," *hurry over*, or *through*, that paradoxical condition of Judaism and the relicts of the Law, "into the glorious liberty of the children of the God." There is no mincing of matters with Paul; but it is as if from his "new" status, he cannot *wait* to "look back like Lot's wife," but as another angel would "lay hold of the hands" of his *Lots*, and "*hasten forwards for their lives*," "not halting in all the plain" until within Zoar. But *how* does he hurry thus? By laying down the indispensableness of our recognizing that great "*grace*" without which "we had been like unto Sodom, and become as Gomorrha." *That* being recognized, a single "instant of time" suffices for the κατοπλαγη "out of the dark into the light."

other is that our Lord emphatically says, "He that is believing unto Me does not come to crisis, yet, ἀλλα, hath passed [μεταβεβ, *mean-passed*] out of the death into the life." Looking at these in our view as an exposition of "Baptism," it may be said, is confusion. I believe so too; but is not this the result of the teaching of our Catechism also? There is no doubt about the "outward and visible sign," for it is expressly said that "water" is the "instrument whereby" what is carefully expressed as a becoming '*regenerate*' — not regener*ated* — is effectuated. It is not so carefully expressed in the office of this sacrament as it is in that of the other, that as in the latter we "*spiritually eat* the body," so here by parity we are *spiritually* 'regenerate.' Neither does there seem such a fuss made about the "mystery" which yet labours to avoid 'transubstantiation' and 'consubstantiation' in the one, as by parity there should be in the other also. If by "mystery" were really *bonâ-fide* meant only the real and very secrecy with which the effect is produced, well; but it is pretended that this *secret operation* is dependent on the instrument and instrumentation, whereby the Officer and Office are extolled, and the Subject proportionately degraded. There can be no mistaking the meaning of the words employed to *teach a child,* to inform and instruct him by our Catechism, though divided into 'two parts,' because they are combined as one 'office.' Yet nothing can be stronger than John's definition and distinction; "I indeed baptize you *with, by,* water unto mid-thought; BUT He will baptize you with, by, Holy Ghost and fire." Here the only point of contact is the "you"; the "water" and the "wind" are wide apart elementarily as the poles, and the Agents also. And whereas, if not the *modus operandi*, yet the *motum operatum*, is most rationally predicable in the one case from observation of others' experiences — the being absorbed, and even drowned, in the profound of

Thought, and therefore no true 'secret' nor "mystery" in the sense pretended; the other is *all secret, all mystery.* It is not the 'catechumen,' therefore, who is responsible for such probable confusion, but the catechiser himself; and how may he say of this *mirabile dictu — probatum est?*

This is not all barren speculation. It is not difficult to most vividly suspect a practical consequence of profound importance, because it has a political as well as a religious bearing.

Humanity naturally "shrinks" from that stage of *deliquium animi* which the Law intimated, and John propounded as the *desideratum.* This is behaviour so instinctive that one wonders whether officialism, so apt to belong to and "puff up" the *head* where instincts are not gendered, is really able to match, to counter-poise, can gain a *bravado* or bravery, out of the heart where instincts *are* gendered, so as to neutralize, or keep all in an *oscillating poise* — and which yet is not that true *bravery* which I believe πραϋτησις in N. T. means. The flight or transition out of night into day is so sudden, all rapid, according to the Catechism, that there is no twilight, no dawn, still less Jonah's "three days and three nights" *duresse*; — the baptized *with water* by "faith" *is* '*regenerate.*' There is no hint at *e. g.* action and passion going on together *pari passu,* which most unmistakeably St. Paul writes of as lasting one's lifetime; but that not only the very "babe" by the promissory "faith" of his sureties is 'regenerate,' which one can well accept as probable, but even the adult is alike translated by the act and fact of the Priest and the water! The Romish Church most logically carries out the issue into '*holy* water,' if the 'Priest' be conceded and accredited. How a Protestant can repudiate the one if he assume the other is hard to say. It is true that our Catechism, and so doubtless the Romish Primer too, lays down the very axiom that "faith" is an

indispensable condition; and it may be said that "charity" demands the concession of its existence, as well as that of a "hope" actuating both parties. And doubtless, not only are we inadequate to "judge" pro or con, but forbidden so to do, as if it were apprehended that we are prone that way. It must, therefore, in propriety and modesty, be doubtful with us, until each party "*knows* the other by his *fruits*." So that anything approaching to even *perfunctoriness* will be scarcely able long to counterfeit a holy "zeal" to the mutual benefit of a genuine fraternity and equality. Indeed the equality is too often repudiated by the one, and superstitiously disconceived by the other.

But suppose that, instead of this, political, or, then, rather, *civic*, exaltation of the 'Priest' were negative instead of positive, relative instead of assumably absolute; that his *prestige* accrued to him by mere and very consistency of status, because of that genuine *general* depression and *deliquium* of the 'commonalty,' which John "heralded" as indispensable; — what then? Surely a wide and open door of "much people in this *or that* city" were presented for "mercy" to enter, whose πολιτεῦμα is not *in* earth, though *upon* earth, but "in the heavens." The hot-housing of the *head* for a 'Priest' quite out-distances the *heart*, the affections, the instincts; which latter do nevertheless grow and grow and grow in all, by virtue of our most native necessities. In such cases *Pity* becomes offensive; and growing discredit is more and more scrupulous and curious at a bedecked *statute-Mercy*. *Why not give room and place to John and his heraldry more conspicuously before we get politically hoisting up ourselves like the serpent of brass? Who* was it that said, "Think not I come to send peace on earth — but a sword; for I came to set at variance," &c.? Why this goes beyond even John's heraldry. It is the statutory machinery "become decrepit, and," 1800 years ago, "ready

to vanish away"; which, as of Divine Institution, far excelling any Pago-Romish caricaturism of it since, or that of any other like *ism*, must give place to *common*-sense, under the rule of *common* Law. Ever since that time, sure, the compromise of expediency has been a political cheat, beguiling, possibly, the Teacher thereof more than the Taught thereby. "For," not with the *head*, but with the *heart*, a man believeth unto justiness or rightiness" in all or any of his undertakings. There was a propriety, Divinely fortified, in the fatal rebuke which befel "Kore and his company" when "the Law" was in its noviciate, and miraculously guaranteed and executed; but there is "a voice of a *growling mass* in the desert," becoming more and more stern continually, to which it were well to take heed — "Ye take too much upon yourselves, ye men of Levi." "The Egyptians, essaying to do" as the Hebrews did at the Red Sea, "were drowned"! For "the powers that be" to 'the religious' of that time were "the State"; but "the Church" claims such honour *now!* "*Belief*" is the instrumental *test*. Pray let 2 Pet. i. 1, be studied — τοῖς ἰσοτίμον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσι πίστιν — "like-precious-to-them-as-to-us-belief"! If such "belief" be present in both parties, no doubt, like the formula of any other 'Sacrament' or Oath, the "taking and receiving" of it is a 'means of *grace*,' that is of χάρις, but not, as is pretended, of χαρισμα. At least, whatever this or the other 'Sacrament' be to "him who is a Jew inwardly," St. Paul certainly does not seem to think it of any avail, unless pernicious, to him who is so but "outwardly in the flesh." His express "judgement" in 2 Cor. v., above cited, and confirmed in Rom., Coloss., &c., is that "*if* then we died with Him," that is Christ, as by "baptism *unto death*," we are "renewable in the spirit of our minds."

How far these considerations may help others as they have myself to arrive at such present results, or how far

hinder by tardiness, I know not. But this I do know, for observation and experience prove at large, that no assumption of authority to dogmatise, where a Paul was wise enough to argue, will long avail. It was by dint of *argument* that St. Paul arrives at that great stand-point — "wherefore we conclude that man is justified by belief without, outside of, the works of the law"; and by *reason* that he reaches the high and profound expediency alleged in — "not of works lest any one should boast." To have lived so long as to witness an authoritative revival — so far as a clique of professors can authorize it, because members of the Profession — of machinery in Protestant England, is most debasing and gross. Since a Lawrence Sterne, by his friend 'Tristram Shandy, gent.', with their broad satirical humour with the '*argumentum fistulatorium*,' though they pitchforked Thomas Aquinas, was not effectual to preclude 'the Gorham Controversy' on Baptism, but it was left for the Privy Council to do the needful; is it really in contemplation to 'try on the same game' in the matter of the other sacrament? Is a sterner than Sterne to be roused, a keener argument than banter, even *battery*, to be used in the matter of 'the Host,' whereby even the 'fig-leaves' of modesty, and τὸ ἄρτον τὸ ἐπιουσιον, shall seem ridiculous as well as 'non-necessary'? — absurd!

In conclusion of this paper, it is admitted as very probable that by carrying out this argument into extremes, by 'pushing conclusions,' we arrive at the subversion of all "decency and order," as well as form and ceremonial. The ready and vivid reply is that whereas a Paul may "conclude" even from premisses of his own devising, we can allow to none now the liberties, or licence, of going to *ex-tremes*, nor of 'pushing conclusions,' in "the secret things which belong to God" and his creatures. Modern Science either in Physics

or Morals would resent such licence instantly and effectually, though probably only in his own breast, and despise the charge of infidelity for so doing. Can the educated mind of this day after so many years of tuition and experience feel comfortable in doing otherwise in matters of Religion? Or if it do, can such comfort be satisfactory to Conscience or even to Reason? If it be so, what must be the worth of the School which turns out such Scholars into the world? Or, are grown men to be continually scholars of a Dame's school? "*Quit you like men*" is the great warning of St. Paul to us, who are to be tried and proved and judged *as* "*men*," and not as "infants." For men 'off duty' the striking features of their "bravery" are modesty, diffidence, deference, which prompt them to "think" with respect to those 'on duty' as of "others better than themselves"; but that "*thinking*" must be "by belief." And when one well and duly considers that "belief" like every other foundation of a superstructure must need be out of sight, and down in the very springs of our being, and yet is the very motive power of our natural being, all may even "stand in awe" of it. I am sure those whose 'Office' it is to cultivate and practise reflection and meditation and consequences must often be profoundly aware of this. Let not these motives of supposed expediency hookwink the Heart, nor even the Mind's central Eye. For the enquiry is becoming daily more suitable and more pressing — "Is the belief to be found upon the card"? Forms and Ceremonials do not necessarily prove the affirmative.

A few hours of digestion and reflection seem to have reduced these perhaps rambling pages to a few Foci which may be thus stated, though the same radii, therein refracted, pursue their course.

Elsewhere I named a great difference between Paul and the other Apostles whose Letters have come down to us

in the Canon. It is very significant that these Letters belong (excepting the short one of St. Jude) to the very three with whom in the person of "Peter before them all," Paul argues this very question about '*belief*' and '*works*.' James insists in his Letter on what appears to have been his view on the subject; and that Letter may prove the stronghold of ritual worship. Peter's two Letters shew that *his* views, so corrected by his visit to Cornelius, had again relapsed by the time of this visit to Antioch; but only to be thoroughly modified,—indeed in his Second, even apologetically modified, when drawing towards his martyrdom. John's three Letters most emphatically pass through the sensuous—of eyes, ears, hands, &c., to "fulness of joy" and to "love." It is thus left for Paul to occupy the *singular stand-point* alone.

It is notable that the three former say little about εκκλησια by name. It seems as if Jerusalem and Judaism was taken to be "the Church" as *matter of course*, ἐνομιζετο, "*lawed*" thus, of old. Peter indeed opens with "Peter, *apostle*;" "James, *servant*"; and John does not name himself; (but neither names his pre-eminence in church). Not one of these, however, so *church-y* is the habit of their mind, and yet so *law-y*, so much *matter of course*, makes prominent what is made so prominent at Heb. v. 4; it seems never to have crossed their mind that this "call" might be not always taken for granted. Nor to this day of ours does it seem to be recognised by us how much more *restrictive to the* twelve is that fact of the Gospel story, that this title "apostle," however Ecclesiastically restricted since, is certainly not limited to the eleven, either in Luke's Gospel or in his Book of the Acts. (Remember that the Ecclesiastical *Title* of this Book is not of Luke's writing.) The Gospel shews quite plainly that very early certain twelve *were* "called," "eclected" from the many; but this great fact they seem to think less of

than that they were "*apostled.*" On the contrary, quite in keeping with Heb. v. 4, Paul, in his Letters to the metropolitan cities of Corinth and Rome, puts κλητὸς, "*called,*" before ἀποστολος "*apostled.*" And well he might; for whereas they were called by Jesus on earth, Paul was audibly "called" by Jesus from heaven, though it was not for him to exaggerate the difference into consequences, except at his own cost. Rom. i. 14; 1 Cor. ix. 16; 2 Cor. xi. 28.

Very striking too is the difference in the course of the men, as agreed upon early by themselves; Gal. ii. 7–9; whereas some "fourteen years after," occasion has arisen for the scene at 11–14. "Orthodoxy" had supplanted '*orthopody*' [*and orthoepy*]; that is the old *seemings* of the Law had usurped the place of and ousted the *facts* and *real* "*Image*" of the Gospel. The "Church," the "Jerusalem which now is" *still,* and which dates its epoch from Egypt only, Law-like indeed for its "season," arrogates, and still continues so to do, the domination of the natural Church, unless rather it superciliously ignores "the Jerusalem which is above" from Adam, Abel, Noah, and the Patriarchs, and reaches its solid acme in "The Christ." I am persuaded that much of this is the history-ground of Paul's argument everywhere; and conspicuously in Rom. ii. iii; that he does *not* so disparage φυσις, "*nature,*" the *responsive capability* of man to his Maker, as ecclesiastical orthodoxy would have it to be disparaged. Moreover I feel a persuasion that it is in this very ground sphere he found his irrefragable position about "*belief,*" πιστις; and if with this leading thought we carefully examine his use of οἶδα, εἰδησις, συνειδησις, &c., as the ultimate appeal in us of all the closest evidence of which our sentient faculties are susceptible, in strongest contrast with all that γνωσις, "*knowledge,*" can at best only by halves apprehend, —then, we will unhesitatingly refer this word πιστις, etymologically, through some aorist form of this verse to the Heb.

ידע, or to יד, as being essentially that very same principle of which to Titus he writes, as actually "*common belief*," as readily as does St. Jude of the "*common* salvation." It is this "falsely-named γνωσις, *knowledge*," not εἰδησις, "*Science*," (E. V. !!! 1 Tim.,) against which he warns Timothy; which of course for its *other halves* of things must depend on -doxies, of suits proper to their kinds. Let Heb. vii. 11, 12, be carefully read in the Greek.

Now this result, which I am persuaded is in the main accurate, if followed out historically involves great consequences. Though I see vast numbers of windows through which "the true Light" of "nature" now shines as it shone before Aaron was born; I am not going to mar the subject by attempting to sketch it. Only I hope some others will prosecute the study for the very Truth's sake, without undue awe of "Bulls" either Popish or British. Let the double ἀγωνα which Paul had to maintain of warding off '*orthodoxy*' (which it is now the fashion to call synonymous with *Judaism*, which all believe to be obsolete, "decrepit and ready to vanish away" along with "the Law" of its constitution,) from its assaults upon *natural orthopody*, (Rom. ii. 14.) let this be duly minded, and "the two-edged sword" in his Letters will seem quite at home in a master-hand. They have certainly not been fairly dealt with by the ablest critics, at least not publicly so; nor are they in such Gentile-shape and form, "as that they may be understanded of the people."

Secondly. Upon this false-premiss, the degradation, and, if it were possible, the very obliteration of Nature, the licensed robbery of the doctrine of '*gratias agere*' has been committed by the grasping "Church." That native and natural feeling which so promptly and warmly responded in Cain and Abel, and with which Human Nature has been and still is teeming to this day, *out of a* "*church*," with its

"What must I do"? and its earnestness *to be doing*, is snubbed in its own budding by the prohibitions of perfunctoriness. "Grace," forsooth, that is, χαρισμα, *grant*, can only flow through certain channels, 'means,' &c., and these authorized, 'cut and dried'! As if "the spirit were given ἐκ μετρου, *out of a measure*," lest it should be exhausted, "*to*" *any body!* John iii. 34. The realm of "*Grace*," χαρις, and the realm of *Nature*, φυσις, are reciprocals. "Nature" is cheated by any artifice; aye and the very Artificial herself is "dragged along in her own craftiness."

But, thirdly. I think that so soon as the proposition is stated it will commend itself; viz., that the above κηρυγμα of John as expressed by Luke, interpreted as is above attempted in its roots and implications, contains the *germs* of all St. Paul's Letters. To take one instance alone, the very subject of our paper; it is Paul alone of all the "Apostles" that *uses* the word "Baptism" as if understanding what it implies; for he not only states it as "baptism unto death," that is, a being naturally *drowned* (which Peter afterwards saw), but he thenceforth argues (as in 2 Cor. v.; Colos. i; Rom v.) "*that we died away.*" E. V. ill renders this aorist, ἀπεθανον, by "*are dead*"; for if the "*taste of* death" sufficed *in law*, for "the Son of the God" in "the son of the man," the same will serve *in law* for "the son of the man" in his *parent man*. It is "over" this parent-man's "*son*" that "the second death hath not ἐξουσια, *licence*": and Rom. vi. 9. It is Paul who elaborates the paradox to "Cephas, James, and John," at Gal. ii., repeated at large at Rom. iv., &c., that "we are not our-selves, for we—the said *selves*—were bought," and therefore *in law* 'died away,' but *in credit* become defunct only. Here again E. V. somewhat misses St. Paul's analytic, by rendering "not our *own*" instead of "*not ourselves*," or "our own *selves*": for a purchaser does not leave his purchases in the shop on the counter—especially such a shop,

such a purchase, such a price! Coll. Colos. iii. 3, 4; where ζωη takes the place of ψυχη.

Lastly, then. In the word '*religion*," I find St. Paul's difference between "*dead*," νεκροι, and '*defunct*,' ἀποθανοντες. Just so do I see it in the Gospel-record of two of Christ's miracles. For whereas "the disciples" and all were rapt in amazement at the several feedings of the 5000 and the 4000, our Lord's concern is about the "baskets-ful of the fragments that remain that nothing be lost." "*Fragments*" —but of a meal! *Fragments*—"dry bones" in Ezekiel's eye, but, of a Host, a 'microcosm'! "*Fragments*," I say, "crumbs," *organized* therefore, the *ruins* of a Fabric, useful therefore, negociable, χρηστα, for another Poem. These are no mere *reliques*, or '*relics*,' as if our word 'religion' were from *relinquo* only, as the Romish practice has idolized them; nor even *relicts*, or *relictuaries* only, as nature most naturally and fondly loves them '*in memoriam*,' and not only *in memoriâ*, of the *defunct*, as well as '*departed*.' The very same Nature, by a very instinct, prompts one to "bury one's dead *relic* out of one's sight," before it becomes revolting, disgusting. Such "salt has lost its savour," and all the Popes that ever lived cannot *canonise* it into salt again! But if we regard, *re-lego* as our word (not with Cicero *re-ligo* which is closely akin to *reliquo* perhaps) we get at the "gathering up of the fragments again, that nothing *eatable* be lost"—rather, "*lose itself*," and so *be wasted*. We do not usually "gather up basketfuls" of *pot-sherds* for instance, unless to "scrape ourselves withal," nor of the worthless, nor of rubbish; but only of the *useable*, perhaps *useable* long after, perhaps never used, yet with a *fancy* which even a miser has liberty to gratify.

Exactly of the same vein, or on the same rail, as seems to me, is the parable of the "woman" and "the leaven." The meal must be the wheat "ground to powder" by the

"stone of stumbling," and then "in three measures of it hidden," the leaven *can work* "until the whole be leavened." It *cannot* do so while all the husks and bran are on it, unless "ground to powder." Yet for all that it is *the wheat* "with the purtenance thereof." This parable is in many ways a puzzle to Commentators. The "three measures," and "the purtenance" of the original "wheat," or "lamb," seems an odd indispensable for "bread"; or any other τὸ ἐπιουσιον, or '*apropos*' convenienced. But there lies the secret; and 'thereby hangs a *tale*,' a very *nisûs* too, which *cannot but be told*. "Who hath ears, let him hear."

These miracles then are, I conceive, interpretants of John's κηρυγμα, or *herald-ment*. The defunct "fragments, say elements, μερη, or *remains* of the *Baptismed* or "*Baptized*," are the elementaries of a "new creation"; just as at first the χοη, or *spume* of the *matrix*, *Gaia*, or the "rib *taken* out of the man's side," were elementaries of the original "creation" of man and "wife."

"Where then is the boasture? It was locked out. By what law?—*that* of the works? Nay, 'sure': yet, by law of belief. We are reasoned then that *by* belief is justified man, outside of works of law." Rom. iii. 27, 28. "Do we then leave Law nought to work on, by the belief's *doing so much?* Far from it; still (αλλα) Law *it is* we should state"; ver. 30; and forthwith, he proceeds to do so in the instance of Abraham; in another part of the history of which very Abraham, St. James grounds his reading of the Law too. In comparing the two the *articles* and the *aorists* are of the highest importance; then there is no discrepancy.

If aught like this be right-ful and lawful, we must surely better "let 'patience' ὑπομονη, *submission*, have her perfect work—that we may be perfect and entire, lacking nothing"; so

that the veriest "searcher for leaven" could discover naught amiss; before we spring into the "new birth."

But the fact and admission is that such "swept and garnished" places are very "few." For whereas "Law" cannot, "the Law" may, be counterfeited. '*Imperium in imperio*' can actually become a very 'beggar on horseback,' knowing no more about the *manêge* of a horse than a clown of a sceptre. Yet what a mischief ensues if such a *regime* be set a going! In other words, suppose orthodoxy be heteropody! and heterodoxy be orthopody! which is it that is not prepared for such a verdict? The Church? or the World? — educated Nature being, as well she may be, at the bottom of both. If the 'cotton-wool' were taken out of the ears of men there certainly would be a reply of no "uncertain sound." Blessed Lord, "who tookest upon Thee our Nature," wast "born of a virgin," "becoming under woman, becoming under Law, that Thou mightest buy off and win them that are also under Law" — "how long, Lord," how long! Let John and the Pedagogue have so thoroughly "prepared Thy *way*" and *mode* of procedure, that we may not continue to be seduced by "the fruit of the tree of the *mere knowledge* of good and evil," to our continual ruin. Oh, help Thou us to be natural — natural — "unto *an* end," "faithful unto *a* death"; and from thence to be "*not our-selfs*," even so much as we think we are now. Augustine, on the verge of *his* "last," records his prayer thus: 'Too late did I love Thee! —— I searched for Thee abroad, deformed I, plunging amidst those fair forms which Thou hadst made; and, all the while, Thou wert with me, but I was not with Thee. Things held me from Thee, which, unless they were in Thee, were not at all"; but they '*were*,' and they are, natural too as when first created; it is we — we — who are non-natural. Our first parents, says

Moses, "were naked" as in the company of the God, "and were not ashamed." Nor should we be ashamed if John's Baptism had effect; for we should either *be*, or "*scarcely be*." It may not be impertinent, too, to remind the "Lawyer" that the descent into Egypt "and sojourn there" for 430 years, and "the captivity in Babylon," for 70 years, was neither of them a short stage even for a Nation's demolition. Then its recuperation subsequently will clearly be wholly extra-ordinary, though the *it* subsist throughout.

After this, as a summary, I am curious myself to see what I can elicit about Human Nature. The non-scientific of this day cannot be aware (except as common sense indeed guards them) of what in chemistry may be termed morally, the *obstinacy* of elementary principles. Decomposition and reunion are familiar phenomena and facts in that science; but it is grounded on the fidelity of elementaries under all sorts of conversion.

Transfer this to our present thought. It is Fürst who says that 'the organic root' of צדק which we render Vulg. *justitia*, N. T. δικαιοσυνη, E. V. sometimes "*righteousness*," sometimes "*justification*," is צ־דק. Of דק we may read *an atom;* as דקק to *reduce to pieces, fine*, &c., in short, not to *decompose*, but to *disintegrate*. Possibly I push '*science*' too far here into the "knowledge" of the Hebrew writers; but it cannot be too far for "*truth*." Precisely thus we read at the outset in the passage from Isa., that, according to Isaiah's account, such a *smashing* of constituents does "*baptize*" the endurer of it. In fact, unless such complete *quasi*-decomposition, or disintegration, or ἀπωλεια, virtual or real, ensues, we can't logically apprehend how intimate and ὁλη reunion is possible, not to say probable. For we are not talking of God's "raising up of *stones* children to Abraham," but of *vivid men*. So the 'nature' of the *atoms* must be

permanent whatever conversion their compounds affect, or assume in appearance, to Angels, Devils or Men: — indeed, "the world knows them not." For, notwithstanding all this, the native, creative and created *obstinacy* persists; so that it is to be inferred from even the Bible of Love, that a damned man is worse intrinsically than a Devil! But then he must be God-damned! Who can look into this? Only those Apostles who argued and pushed "*Law*," *e. g.*, Jude, and the Jews generally, and indeed Greeks and Romans in their turn, who called their neighbours "barbarians": — never mind what the name means; '*slavery*' has shewn from of old to this day what the *animus* means.

What is Paul's grand aim at the end of his vista? "That ye may be filled into all the πληρωμα ful-filled-ment of the God"; Eph. iii. 19; in as magnificent terms as at Coloss. ii. 9. What means this, but that we *now* are contributories to that mighty achievement?

Nor is Peter, at length, a whit behind; 1 Peter i. 3, *et seq.* "Eulogued-able is the God — He having *up*-born us unto a hope — unto an inheritance — that has been reserved in heaven unto us who in very ability of God are being made garrisons *thereof* by belief, unto a salvation ready-prepared to be disclosed in (one's) last opportunity," &c.

Whence this probability, even possibility, but from native or natural capability, answerable to "God's much mercy"? Can we refuse to "live and move and be"?

It seems to me that had Man been *fairly*, even *naturally*, dealt with by even Man during this 1800 years, such a system of Egyptian Hieroglyphics as still prevails had been hardly possible, certainly unlikely. The truth is that 'civilised' man is not half so true to himself as the 'savage.' If this be so with the Teachers, it follows of course with their Scholars. What mirrors, what reflections, then, must these be of those!

Some 300 years ago strong common sense under God revolted against Romanism. Shall England plead God now in taking a leaf out of her Book at a lower vantage-ground of antiquity and arrogance, hopeful to hoodwink common sense on another tack?

It is allowed, I believe, that our Liturgy and Articles, with a grand political front against foreign interference — a holy, sound, and most natural resistance — yet, procured political quiet by collusion and compromise. But the Title to *our* 'Articles' shews that the motive, mighty, glorious as it was, was no lasting match for the audacity of *Romish* arrogance. It was a just motive; '*ad tollendam opinionum dissentionem, et consensum in vera Religione confirmandum,*' and the Royal Authority for the edition of them was all-sufficient. Yet, Art. ix., from which all the rest following thereto, quite as it were mechanically flow, actually invites repugnance. Who, since A. D. 1530, with the story of the Jews (Rom. x. 2, 3) in his ken, dreams of establishing his own 'original *justitia*, righteousness, or justification,' "before God"? What mean all the sacrifices, vows, hecatombs of the old Ethnick world, if they did not explicitly declare the '*quam long. distet,*' which the 'elect' thought it necessary to urge, as if disputed? If Rome's arrogance of the 'Cleric' assumption made it excusable, why still involve the whole vulgar community in the same suspicion of self-sanctimoniousness?

This, however, has prevailed for now more than 350 years; to the great damage of Man's recognition of his genuine and most *natural* responsibility to, not only the behests and the terrors of Law, but to the forgivenesses, the overlookings, the allurements, of Pity and Kindness and Love. *This* state of things is unnatural if you please! It seems as if by very recoil from the assault on Romish audacity, Pro-

testantism has undermined the very "pavement" of its own fortitude and virtue. Howard and Mrs. Fry found it true and genuine in our very Prisons.

Section 9.

Doubtless it will be to many persons very unsatisfactory to have *reduced*, as they may think, what they may understand by the term "repentance" to any such common-place idea as '*wonder*.' I confess to the same feeling myself, but I know not a better; and yet feel persuaded that the former very term misleads and deceives us. It is not only not impossible, but even very probable, that *Technics* themselves who use the word do misconceive the idea and substitute a fiction in its place. It would comport with current views to reply; then of course it is not to be wondered at, that, if Technics misconceive, these others still more. To a great extent this is true; yet there are few educated persons, who though they *misconceive*, are not actually *misled*. Why a few?

Technics have monopolized the world, and are responsible for much; but the carelessness of the world about these matters is equally responsible for as much. It has come to pass, however, that between the two a perfunctory excess on the one hand, and a slip-shod laxity when convenient on the other, may have beclouded the idea and ourselves too. The result is that we do not *think;* for *half-thinking* is *not thinking*. —— When we say *we think, it* means, however we may deceive ourselves that *we do* mean it, that *we opine*. That is to say, we *give the benefit of our opinion* to any subject-matter from God down to Reason; and we flatter ourselves that we flatter Them that *we think*.

The urgency of the Bible for our *thinking* is most plain in the book of Isaiah. This was the burden under the

"old covenant" — "Have known thou the Lord"; whereas the "new" declares "all shall, or will, *feel*, '*science*,' Me from the least of them unto the greatest; for," Heb. viii. 10–12; which implies that we "shall" not only *give to God the benefit of our opinion*, δοξα [!] but *get the benefit thereof* if we choose. Does our getting the benefit of God then turn on our *opinion* of God? Certainly, so far as such benefit exceeds *animal* requirement, primarily and in a proximate sense; then, secondly, it is coequal to our "*thinking*" about Him, responsively.

Now *that* 'thinking' which is a getting or forming an *opinion* or "glory," as when we say, 'I think so and so,' is simply an *assent* to a vague impression; it needs hardly any *mind*; it is almost simply *sensuous*. The *giving* of that opinion or "glory" is a step further; for that bespeaks *consent with* the impression, in other words "con-science," *con-sense*. But neither does this require *mind* for its production; though it must perhaps involve *mind*, co-etaneously, in our present estate. Thus it is that *mind*, in the form of *memory* at least, will retain and revive, or at least repeat, that very same impression, long after the idea, whence it was derived, has quite faded from the "conscience," or consentience; but then only to be shuffled or ousted by some new idea that foists itself afresh upon the sensuous. We do not '*think*,' in the true sense of the term, when we say we *opine*, or *are of opinion*, that so and so; we *glorify* the 'so and so'; and the 'so and so' *glorifies* us in return. But if a mutual *blinding* of both ensue, and both prove wrong, *we* are responsible for both; for we did not "*think*"; and perhaps 'so and so' was not possessed of the organ for "thinking" *ad libitum* as we are.

Also that '*thinking*' means a vast deal more than "*repenting*" we may feel assured, inasmuch as there is *another* word which means this latter. I do not refer to the very

remarkable word (also perhaps compounded of νο, in some active voice form, μναομαι), so extensively and emphatically used in 'the sermon on the mount,' Matt. vi. 24–34; much as if we said, "*I wonder* — what we shall eat, or what shall we drink," &c; still less as if "*I court, woo, sue for*, what we shall eat," &c. Though this, I conceive, would abet my argument about μετανοία; but the etymology is too complicated to pursue it.

What we *call* "repentance" is in N. T. μεταμελεία. Compare μελ- here, with μερ- just above; and recall the force of μετὰ which has been contended for. The Lexicon gives for this word '*change of purpose, regret, repentance*'; (omitting the idea of *change*) what more or fuller signification could our notion of "*repentance*" require? But this is *not* John's word, nor the New Testament word, nor the word which the Romanists render by '*do penance*.' Any 'penance' that we can 'do,' any 'penitence' which we can 'work up,' into 'regret,' 'repentance,' or even 'remorse,' or which 'the Priest' can conjure and impose on us, will not impose upon God. Even to dare such a dream surely ignores, if it do not deny, that "our bodies are temples of Holy Ghost." Accordingly, "true repentance" *is denied* by many; though "lilies of the field" and "the grass of the field," are expressly held up by our Lord as presumptive proofs of the truth of His expectation from our capabilities.

Yet, accordingly also, the true and full conception of '*Wonder*' is very hard to revive. There may be a more suitable term than this *from our stand-point*, which is below *par*, but one does not occur to me; and for want of a better I use this, as expounded, even for "the heavens," by the prophet Jeremiah. "Be astonished, O ye heavens, at this, and be horribly afraid," &c.; but that, again, is the view from a stand-point above *par*. *Grant* the term — "*wonder*."

There is a beautiful passage at 2 Cor. vii. which brings

these two words into comparison. The argument of the chapter mounts up to "comfort," and "joy"; and then, "rejoiced the more," is instanced in ver. 8; "*Item*, if even I grieved you in the letter, I am not REGRETTING if even I was REGRETTING; for I see—it grieved you. 9, Now I rejoice, not, *Item*, ye were grieved, but [ἀλλ'?] *Item*, ye were grieved into WONDER, for ye were grieved κατὰ θεὸν, *a la* God," *au Dieu, after the manner of God.* — 10, "For the *a la* God grief works down WONDER into a safety UNREGRETTEDABLE; and [δὲ] the world's grief ['*cosmos*'] works down death" *of all fictions and figments that belong to the world.* 11, "For lo this very thing, your being *a la* God grieved, what sort of "*efforts*" it was working down *for*, or *to*, you"!

Now it is impossible to mistake the majesty of this "*grief*"; I contend equally so for the "*Wonder* into a safety not to be regretted," which no amount of factual, without actual, *thinking* could have brought. All the "*grief*" which the several '*penances*' ever imposed by the severest Cosmos since Moses's, could not have inducted that "*Wonder into safety*"; their, and its, *most valuable* issue is "death." *Most valuable;* for John and St. Paul imply that this is the "*way* unto the departure of sins." We shall see more on this point further on.

And now see a passage early referred to in Part. I., viz., 1 Sam. xv. 29. "And also the Strength of Israel will not lie nor WONDER; for He "is not a man [= a *lie*, or *liar*] that He should WONDER."

Of course, *regret*, "repent," as if at defection of man, is not to be thought of by us here. I say *of course;* but it is not such a *matter of course* that the "He should *not* WONDER." The true conception of 'Wonder' *necessarily* involves the *truth*, that is the *reality*, of the cause or occasion of that 'wonder;' as is very properly argued about "faith" also. I conceive that proof of both propositions is afforded

by Heb. xii. 17, read by the light of the whole of chap. xi. It is about Esau.

"For ye understand [ἴστε], *Item*, even afterwards wishing to have inherited [*as first-born*] the eulogy [*of birthright*], he was dis-proofed; for of WONDER [*in Isaac, at the discovery of Rachael's and Jacob's craft*] he found not a *tope* ['*rap*'] although amidst tears having made search for it." To bring in the idea of Esau's hoping to alter the attitude of old Isaac, would be most damaging to the idea of Esau's behaviour as evidence for *his* view of his father's "*belief*." The strong point is, that though Esau could regret, and grieve, and cry tears abundantly, could show the craft and subtlety practised upon Isaac and himself, and could point to Jacob's departure from home, father, kin, &c., yet Esau "found not a rap of WONDER" in old Isaac's mind at the result. Esau, too, knew he had "*sold his birthright*" to Jacob.

That the "belief" of Isaac in God should so utterly preclude "*Wonder*" at the developement of the ways of God, is of course a wonderful truth to all genuine Esaus *now;* is it so to all Jacobs *now?* But let neither forget that simple transaction over "a mess of pottage," which involved such vast consequences; nor that this occurred long before Moses's time, and "the giving of THE Law."

To my own mind and thinking, then, the substitution of the idea and word 'WONDER' for the idea and word "*Repentance*," or '*Penitence*,' or '*doing Penance*,' is not only shewn to be justifiable, but far preferable; because it is more true to the nature of the case, and of things in the general, so far as we can fathom it and them. And it is *we*, men, who are the Object of the Bible.

Discursion 1.

The word ἴστε, whatever its parent root may be, is apparently so closely akin to πίστις, so important a word, that I venture to speculate here.

The verbs ἵστημι, ἵζαμαι, ἐπιζαμαι, all seem to have the subst. verb εἰμὶ as their basis, all meaning more or less emphatically, '*scio*,' to *know*, as if to '*skill*.' So the various inflexions of εἴδω, 'I *see*,' into οἶδα, οἶσθα, ἵζεον, &c., also mean to *know*, as if *sentio*, to *feel*, to be 'able *to tell*.' They appear to be pure declaratives, or 'demonstratives,' as we say of pronouns. But ἵστημι itself seems referrible to some dialectic variety of the first aor. of εἴδω, εἴσω, as its ἧσα among some other verbs also, is identical with the obliques of εἰμὶ. This belongs to *present* tenses; but coming to *perfects*, we remember the Latin *fui*, as if from *feo*, and the English *was*, *were*, from to *be*. Still all *declaratives*, and all too strong to express πίζις; as the declarative ἐζὶ, for instance, *he*, or *it*, *is*, seems to preclude the mere *belief* that he, or it, *is*.

The reference of πίζις to πείθω, notwithstanding great authorities for it, seems still more objectionable for the same reason; though it would be very convenient to find it correct. So far as the *imperfect* tense, meaning *literally* '*imperfect*,' approximates to the Greek '*aorist*,' it suits and serves the purpose; for we get to πιθανός. For if we give this the sense of the *probable*, as distinguished from *the possible*, we get, I believe, the force of the Greek *verbals*, which certainly are best referred to the *aorists*, as to form, and also power.*

Theologically, indeed, when we read St. Paul's exposition of Habakkuk, by ἐκ πίζεως εἰς πίζιν, "*out of belief into belief*," it is hard to say whether *persuasion* goes to *belief* or "*faith*," or "*faith*," *belief*, goes to *persuasion*. But if either be correct, and this derivation of the word reduce the matter to a mere question of tense, degree, time, why was not πείθεια used in the one or other place instead of πίζις, if they be convertible, because of their common radical?

Is it improbable that another line may be traced for all

* See Donaldson's '*New Cratylus*,' and 8vo. *Greek Grammar*.

those verbs first named, out of πι, the old 'article,' so called, but perhaps 'interrogative' and then 'relative'; as with ποϛ, ποσσος? Why is there not a πιϛ, analogous to them, answering to τιϛ? But since that would lead to πι-ν, τι-ν, while we have ποϛ = πο-τ, where shall we find a correspondent but in πιθ-, or πιτ-? Does this necessarily suggest πειθω? I think not. For πι-ν, we get to πινω regularly; but πι-ϛ, or πι-τ brings us quite as regularly to the valuable word πι-πι-σκω, *fut*, πισω; which gives us all we want. Its regular first aor. pass. would be ἐπισθην, which, stripped as usual, yields πιϛος. There would still be a difficulty with πιϛις, however, unless this likewise be referred to this *pass.* first aor. making it thus differ wholly from verbals, or nouns, in -σις, which I believe are referrible to the first aor. *act.*—not to the act. *fut.*, as the Latin words in *-tura* are deemed to mean in our English words in *-ture*, 'nature,' 'creature,' 'future,' &c. Even the Latin 'fut. in *rus*,' as a *passive*, should have precluded this.

These words in τις, Bopp (Eastwick, ed. 1856, p. 1155) calls 'abstracts in *ti*,' and says they correspond with certain Sanscrit *pass.* participles. But then he regards, p. 1157, the τ of πίϛις as 'a *t*-sound weakened to σ.' Now forasmuch as πιν- is the radical inflection of one form of πι-ϛ, and I claim πισ- as *ditto* for another form of πι-ϛ, as in the verb πιπισκω, compared with πινω, our word, πίϛις, is properly πισ-θις, "weakened to" πισσις; but that it is not only *not so* weakened, while yet weakened inasmuch as it is *defined* by change of θ = ת to τ = ט.

Although then Bopp, in parenthesis, compares πισ-τι-ϛ with πεῖ-σις, they are different words; and the former, I believe, may be referred as is above done. Compare John iv. and vii. 37, where we have πιν- throughout; but then either the "*give*," or the imperative "*let him*," is supplied; whereas πίσω, ἐπισα, *includes* this, as does "belief."

Thus, then, not only this word, but *all* 'verbal abstracts' may be correctly referred to some first aor. pass. participial form; and from this composite formation they actually suggest the meaning of *probability, i. e. provability,* as participial characteristic. The entire argument and urgency of Scripture I believe sustains this view; but the consequences may prove revolutionary.

Besides; against the evidence for πειθω, the one strong passage of St. Paul at 1 Tim. i. 12 seems conclusive; as also that he places *belief* or "faith" *before* "persuasion." He writes, "I have believed, or *faithed,* and have been persuaded [*am being persuaded?*]"

Essentially then the radical πι-σ seems to be *a relative* "out of" an interrogative, like our *who, what;* and all such words as ἵ-ημι ἵ-ος, &c., the more 'perfect' tenses of ἴσ-, as respondents. Just as the modern Italian brings in *stato,* &c., as the auxiliary for the past tenses of *ess-er-e,* to be.

Discursion 2.

I will notice one point here having some bearing on our subject. When I said that Esau "*knew* that he had sold his birthright," what other Bible-Greek synonyme would we use for "*know,*" so that we may all agree?

The first word in the passage quoted from Heb. xii. 17, I rendered "*understand,*" where E. V. has "ye *know.*" The latter is more correct, as the Lexicons have accepted; but then, there is a great deal of doubtful philology and grammar thus implied. "Ye *know,*" ἴ-σε, is a syncopated form for ἴσατι, from ἴσημι; but ἵ-σαμαι, which does mean "*understand,*" though better so as ἐπίσαμαι, is but a passive verb formed upon the first aorist 'verbal' of the former. It is thus primarily very closely connected with oblique forms of εἰμι, and perhaps of ἵ-ημι, as the *Italian* language has brought out the latter. But what I particularly wish to clear is that

our old word '*wist*, '*wiss*,' '*wit*,' '*wot*,' &c., are very likely to be referred hither; for I have often adopted these as synonyms for οἶδα and its belongings; there the former is hardly an adequate parent of the word πίστις, "*belief*." And yet we may use the word εἴδετε, one would have thought, in that passage; but no. In a kind of vague way, as φησι means 'says he,' or 'says it,' or rumour, or anybody else; so here, as we vaguely say, as if interjectionally, '*so and so, you understand? so and so.*' It does not mean, "ye wist," still less "ye *faith* or believe"; nor "ye know," except as haply ye have *read*, or the Priest toned it for you. Still less does it mean "*know*," γνο, as *notion-knowing*, as the result of having *given mind* to it, of having *thought about* it as having any bearing on, or reference to, you, and so knowing.

But what if it mean "*ye self*"? For it seems to be the very pronoun ἵ, or rather ἴ, *turned into a verb, q. d.* whether it belong to εἰμι, or to any other form. It thus becomes a verb of the very closest, homeliest intimacy. Look at the contrasting context about Sinai, and then the transition to Sion. It brings first-borns to estimate "birth-rights" *in esse*, as distinct from *in posse*, whether *past* or *future*; to estimate loss and the *promissory*; in short, to *wist*, the *negative*, as by "belief," while still *belief* is short of knowledge or *sense* of the *positive*, if we may or can divine so deeply. It is a recognition of *the probable*. And yet it is an advance upon 'ye *opine*.'

There may be a handle thus for the Casuist to seize, if he be so minded; yet the association with Esau and his story, and with the Priest's reading of it, and a worshipper's hearing of it, suggest a very *impotency* which is due, not to "the infirmity of the flesh," but to the imbecility of the mind. There is a profound study here for the Casuist.

By thus coming to Esau and merely '*wisting*' we certainly

seem to have got along way off from what we have just sought for. But does not the story shew Esau to have been fairly *natural?* Certainly not. A man to sell his Estate for "a mess of pottage"! He was an idiot, a fool. He obeyed *appetite*, not *mind*. Yet what if that be a "way" to wisdom and to "belief"? or as St. Paul wishes that a man may "become a fool that he may be wise."

This is but a perfect analogy to John's heralding! "Sins"! "We have Abraham to our father"! We have 'mother church,' and Priests and Popes all guarantees for us! "Sins"! "We by nature Jews, and not of Gentiles 'sinners'" —— what "sins" can *we* have? We are Jacobs that supplanted all the Esaus that ever were! Strange, that we do not see that Jacob was what he is by a *ruse*, which to Esau was a fraud; a very *left-handed* procedure, if not a *wrong* one! Here too is a loop-hole for the candid Ritualist.

But follow the Cains and Esaus *as naturals* into the world; one can readily see that the Seths and the Jacobs must, for some deep and wonderful reasons, have been their superiors, though younger born. St. Paul takes up, with the Legalist, the argument from "election"; and so accredits God as mere Arbiter, to do what He will, as the Potter or the Modeller does what he will, with the "clay" or the *plasma*. We are only adopting his own argument about "Law" and "the Law" in Ep. to Galat., when we urge that προθεσις, as "*Purpose, by nature*, cannot become effete or inert through "Purpose" by *subsequent* "Election" or preference; as he himself urges in Ep. to Romans, ix. 30. More especially may this be if the Pagan outcast consciously grows a bigger "fool" and the occupying favoured incumbent become more and more conceited, vapid, and offensive, Rom. xi. 32. The parable of the two sons, Matt. xxi. 28, is exactly in point. If the one be getting less and less natural

through extravagance, and the other more and more unnatural by hot-house care, have we not, at least probably, in respect of *par*, 'six of one and half a dozen of the other'?

And if we come to *hope*, which is *most hopeful?* According to Solomon, of the one which "is cut down;" so too of the prodigal; so says all Nature; and so says all observation and experience. It is assuredly a fearful thing to be, like 'a dog in the manger,' occupying only to abuse; to "take away the key of knowledge" and so "hinder them that" were coming to slake their thirst. Privilege does but magnify obligations. "The righteous called to "WONDER" is more a hopeless business than "the sinners called to wonder,"—both being *responses*.

Application.

Now John in the wilderness *lowed* indiscriminately to the Esaus and Jacobs of his time, only that all were Israelites, which we suppose *these* two brothers were not. In respect of his mission he has no peculiar restriction, for it was not only to "them that are under *the* Law." It was a matter of course that Gentiles, such as publicans and "soldiers," were not "under the law," because they "by nature are sinners." But John's mission, even if so restricted, is still a call to "baptism *by* water," or "*with* water;" though he preached, or heralded, "baptism of WONDER." It must have been a *wonder* that Jesus "mixed" with, and 'took salt' with, "publicans and sinners"; and that He declared moreover that He "came to call the sinners into WONDER, not the righteous." And he works *naturally*, "openly before *the world*," both as to doctrine and kind deeds. There was no mistaking the character by naturals even among the Jews; but "the righteous" were most indignant and insulted.

We need not follow out the issue with them; we 'understand' it from what we read. Even the very Cross, and He that hung thereon, lived thereon, died thereon, was perhaps not a wonder to them, any more than 'the Crucifix' to-day. We have it improved upon to-day indeed into the 'mysterious,' the 'mystical,' and the bewilderingly 'stupefying'; but it is no WONDER. "The carpenter saws and planes; with part he roasts, &c., and the residue thereof he maketh a God"! No, no! Not a God to the 'intelligent,' only to "the ignorant, and them that are out of the way." Be it so; *they* have to settle the matter. There are many idols too, besides crucifixes; but all of them together, from the Bible to a 'toe-nail,' cannot create in us a genuine WONDER; cannot make us "astonished, nor be horribly afraid," though "the kingdom of the God is within us." What if we say, *because* "the kingdom of the God is within us" after all?

Donaldson (*New Crat.* § 164, p. 275, 2nd edit.) has a striking passage which this last text should bear upon. But as it involves one of the very points I am contending for — the responsivity of Nature — it must suffice to quote it. "The syllables τος, *tus*, *thas* [Sanscrit], as Bopp has properly observed, imply *motion from* a place, and the Latin termination *tus* is constantly found in that sense, as in *cœli-tus*, from heaven, *sub-tus*, from under, *in-tus*, from within; — ἔν-τος, *intus*, &c. But the more usual form is θεν," &c. These are no mean philologists which thus write; but their decision may not suffice to decide a profound theological point like this. The Lexicons give us both ἔνθεν and ἔνθα, which should *thus* equal ἐντος; but then we have ἔντοσθεν besides.

Although authority such as this may be disputed, particularly in connexion with this passage from Luke xvii. 20, it will not do to evade the force of the text by resolving into the *general* scope of "the realm or reign of the God,"

what is evidently meant to be particular. It is especially opposed to "it cometh not μετὰ παρατηρήσεως, that is, amidst scrupulous or rigorous '*observation*,' or *taking care*," as if it were "here," or "there." Viewing the matter as I do, namely, as referring to the *responsivity of man* by nature, the above conclusion is just. Is it not the very argument of St. Mark, iv. 28, relying on this even as respects "the earth" or land, γη, when he says of it, αὐτοματη, "*self-taught*, or self-motived, *q. d.* it bears fruit"? Does he not as much as say, 'how much more then it should be so in *man*?' If "the *fear* of the Lord be the beginning of wisdom," is it thinking too much of natural man to say that profound Thought ending in *Wonder* is the 'beginning of the end' of the *natural man?* And we forget that there is *a beginning* "day by day."

When Nathan, after his touching parable, said to David, after his royal indignation, — "*Thou* art the man!" — did not David *wonder?*

When Pilate, puzzled beyond measure at the astonishing vindictiveness of the Jews and their pretended loyalty to Cæsar, and at the noble dignity of Jesus, said, "What is the truth" (of this matter)? — did not Pilate *wonder?* Still more, too, if he meant "*the truth*" as Jesus referred to it.

When the Philippine gaoler saw what had happened to the prison, and concluded that, of course, all the prisoners had fled, and drew his sword to kill himself, *wonder* surely principally wrought the *terrified* apprehension, even at the consequences to himself, and was the dominant and most conspicuous feeling in the man; for Paul cried out, "Do thyself no harm, for we are all here." Is it even probable that his cry, "What does it behove me to do, so that I be safe" [or "*saved*"]? — referred to other than his political or municipal safety? Paul's, *then following* answer, turning his thoughts, unhinged as they were, to another and higher

theme, seizing the opportunity, "buying out the occasion," was most Christian-like in him; and what followed was very natural in the gaoler, (considering the state of the public mind,) whatever it was besides. The turmoil in the man's mind, described in ver. 27, "prepares *the way*" for all that follows.

There is no occasion, in "zeal for God," to wrest nor to snatch passages from most concordant stories and most natural occasions; as though the Bible were poor in its stores of wonders, and so must give its "spirit out of a measure." Some day or other, the simple grandeur, beauty and poetry of the Bible narratives, times, seasons, eras and occasions being taken into account, and the *therefore* naturalness of all, even of its enthusiastic hyperboles, will greatly astonish good people! The Bible 'needs no bush' now.

Section 10.

One of the first in importance and highest features of *the natural* in man is *candour;* and yet beyond childhood it is hardly to be looked for. But this is no disparagement of *nature* in man; it is of *man* in nature. Looking at 1 John iii. 3, and its context, ver. 4, I suspect that the word ἁγνεία, as used there, is its true synonyme; = "*purity*," simplicity. We may not look for *purity*, but we may for *candour;* and yet by the E. V. adoption of "*purified*" and "*pure*" in this passage we are extremely liable to be led off into the association of *legal* "purification," καθαρισμος, &c. This is probably wrong here. Again we are led by the Vulgate "*sanctificat*" and "*sanctus*" into thoughts which are certainly below the English idea of "*holy*," "*hallow*," &c. Further, insomuch as the word *candour* is Latin, and has much to do with *whiteness*, — as we speak of the *silvered* hoary head, — we may imagine that it means *cleanness*.

These all lead us astray. According to our English use and meaning of the word we understand something very like, if not identical with, *truth, truthfulness.* There is indeed a *sheen* or *brilliancy* about both candour and truth which no shams can withstand in conflict, nor long rival even out of conflict. It may be hazardous, imprudent to be *candid* at all times; it may even be unwise, as when David said, "I withheld my tongue even from good while the wicked was before me," and he a king, "*the* Psalmist."

But there are times when *candour* is everything for us. As, for instance, when relinquishing the fancy as well as efforts of "purifying *myself,*" "sanctifying *myself,*" to be "*pure*" or "*sainted*" by my own or any other man's manufacture or manipulation, I stand, if I do stand, *candid,* indeed, but with "*shame*"; *shining,* indeed, but "*black,*" even "in my own eyes." Such will be the case, inevitably, the nearer we approach to a *truthful* "homology of '*sins,*'" *wrongs, unrightnesses, unfairnesses, injuriousnesses, &c.;* when even a '*left-handed*' success may prove a horrid victory. Really, *wonder* and *candour,* even natural both, are thus very close together. If we compare the four Gospels with this point in view as to their respective descriptions of *John* and the *people* that came to him as *one picture,* we shall be struck with the different import of the Gospels.

Matt. iii. 1. "In the those days there by-happens John the Baptist heralding in the desert of the Judæa, and 'leging, 'WONDER' ye! For neared has the reign of the heavens. —— 5, Then went out towards him Jerusalem and all the Judæa and all the neighbourhood of the Jordan; and they were BAPTIZED in the Jordan under him, *ex-homologuing* their 'sins.'"

Mark i. 4. "And there came to be John, he BAPTIZING in the desert, and heralding baptism of WONDER into departure [*dismissal*] of 'sins.' 5, And there went out towards

him all the Judæan 'land'; and all the Jerusalemites were baptized under him in the Jordan river, *ex-homologuing* their sins."

Now already there is a great difference perceptible respecting the people. *Mark* says "*the Jerusalemites* were baptized," as if that were the chief feature; yet he says nothing about "*Wonder*," *as if that fact were enough*. *Matthew* says *everybody* went at the behest of "*Wonder*."

Both agree as to the "ex-homology of *their* sins," by which I understand *candour;* but it is very remarkable that neither *Luke* nor *John* say one word about this last point. St. *John* takes it up worthily indeed of its true import and right position in the Christian scheme in his first *Epistle*, from whence we quote about *candour;* but in the Gospel, not a word.

Some explanation of this may seem afforded in the *three* first Gospels' qualifying *addenda;* thus,

Matt. iii. 11. For I indeed you do baptize in water into WONDER; but," &c.

Mark i. 4. — "baptizing in the desert and heralding a baptism of WONDER, &c. — the Jerusalemites in the Jordan river."

Luke iii. 16. "I indeed *by*, or *with*, water do baptize you; but," &c.

Now these "*buts*" seem to throw all this so much into the foreground as if, but for such poetry in the painting and the Painter, it had been lost. For how does St. John treat of this for John.

John i. 26. "I baptize in the water [*Cod. Sin.*]; amongst [? μεσος] you there stood Him whom YE wist not.—31, I also had not wist Him; but so that He were manifested to the Israel, along of this came I in the water baptizing." Again, 33, "I also had not wist Him; but He having sent me to baptize in water, That was He who said to me," &c., &c.

It seems to me too that Acts xix. 1–7, about the "certain disciples" at Ephesus, exhibits the same *cue;* that is, now some, perhaps many, years after John; and throwing *his* "baptism of wonder" quite into the shade. Accordingly, as if it were no baptism, "they were baptized" then and there; although Paul himself writes (Ephes. iv. 5) "one faith, *one baptism*," &c. But for his own clear declaration at 1 Cor. i. 17 it might be safely contended here that *Paul* did baptize them then and there; (our stops, and capitals, and especially the "*which*" in E. V. all possibly mislead;) for the reading is, "and the Paul having been putting [or *setting, laying*] upon them the hands there came the Holy Ghost upon them," &c.— as if *that* was *the* baptism referred to in ver. 5.

And why not? Only because we can scarcely think of "baptism" without "*water*"! Paul, no doubt, uses the solemn sign, *as a sign solemn*, of "laying on his hands," as he reminds Timothy about himself; 1 Tim. iv. 14; but no "*water*" seems necessary. It may be said — "but Timothy was circumcised"; well; but there is no evidence that these "twelve men," "disciples," were so.

So it seems to me that the very Gospels themselves, fairly collated, quite preclude the very chance of 'holy-water' manufacture, consistently with candour on both sides, common-sense and truth.

And even respecting "signs" our Lord's language is startling. He implies that *it is* "an evil and adulterous generation that seeketh after a sign." He discovers to them—"except ye see signs and wonders ye will not believe"; and states those to be "far advanced, who not having seen yet believe." So Paul; "The Jews seek after a sign, the Greeks wisdom." If, then, a *sign* be important and gravid to a "generation," it is a *sign per contra* that the "generation is evil and adulterous," *may be*. Thus it becomes

a terrible fact, if it be a fact, that 1800 years of schooling have left the scholars as affectible by *signs* as they are by *realities!*

But I think the truth is plain that as John stated the object and purpose of *his* baptism to be, *quasi*, "part of the parable into the occasion that instanded" (*then*, or *at any time since*), "until an occasion, or opportunity, of διορθωσις, *i. e. rectifying division*," occurs (Heb. ix.); that is, as if he, John, like the little priests, indicated the ripest fairest "Lamb" as victim for the great priest's handling, &c.; as if John states thus, so Paul here seems to *act* that 'imposition of hands' is as good a *sign* as "water," to bring up its ally—*wonder*. "What *mean* ye by this?" is the grand point.

These twelve "disciples" had been "baptized into John's baptism"; yet they had neither "received," nor "so much as heard if there is, Holy Ghost." Then Paul expounds John: the men respond, "having heard" [not "heard *this*," as E. V.], too, were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus, and the Paul having been putting upon them the hands, then came the Holy Ghost upon them, they did talk too [τε] with tongues and did preach [*fore-say*, &c.]" These were deemed genuine responsive "*signs*" indeed, as also by Peter and his in the house of Cornelius; yet perhaps in neither case was "*water*" employed. Indeed in the latter case it would have been perfunctory, supererogatory with a vengeance; and yet very probably it was done, judging from the practice of 'Early Church." Just as Paul was 'no-where' but a "wreckling" UNTIL "*called*" by Holy Ghost!

Is it even *Greek* "wisdom" that *signs* should be so cultivated as to snap the very chance of *genuine natural* "*Wonder*"? '*Discipline*.' Discipline! "Thou, that 's [ὁ] disciplining others, disciplinest thou not thyself" *in* and

by, and *with the so-doing?* Surely, then, there is such a thing as "baptism" without the instrumentality of water or of man.

John, however, for a special purpose, comes practising an old rite very expressively, which heretofore, as at this day, every cook perhaps practises after the butcher's work, for most useful purposes. But then, with a quite new intent, he is directed to adopt it. Here we are on quite another scent. St. John alone, it is much to be noted, remembers and records this fact. As it is impossible to read of the career of Moses without becoming persuaded of Divine interference with the natural course of things, so it is impossible to read John's account of his instructions and consequent practice, simplifying, but intensifying, *focus*-ing, all that Moses instituted upon *One*, as yet unknown, chief Constituent of it.

The writer to the Hebrews makes a great deal of such a fact as this in respect of Melchisedec; just as in Egypt the Jews had done of all their sacred Title-Deeds and Histories. No one knows about the beginning, but all implicitly trust in them and their contents, and interpret them literally; though an Abraham, as Abram, was a new beginning; Shem and Noah a new beginning; Sheth and Cain new beginnings; and for aught they, or their writings, plainly shew, Adam and Eve were a *new* beginning. But since they were certainly wrong about "Jesus, the Nazarene," whom John testified to, *we* need not fear a moment for the sanctity of their records in supposing that they were wrong also in their interpretation and exclusive application of them. This is a large proposition; but I conceive that Heb. xi. 3 most amply admits and sustains it.

Being so, we are reduced to the force of *facts*, or rather, the contemporaries of John were; and *we* to the credibility of *their* testimony. And WE too, if wise, will be content

without pretending to *say*, as if we *know*, that "IN this *belief*, or *credit*, were testimonied," *from John*, "the elders"; those too who, since John, have lived and died all "according to *belief*," ver. 13; for we cannot *know* it; and they "were testimonied by the *belief*," ver. 39. For our Saviour's own emphatic warning is, that "if we hearken not of Moses and the Prophets, neither shall we be persuaded if haply any one rose out of the dead." It is not said that we shall not *believe* while we "hearken," but shall not be *persuaded*." So we, if we believe, *i. e. hearken*, not the testimony of our dying parents to the same belief, we must be in a hopeless condition indeed. *This* is the strong line of continuity in our days; no *mere* "*succession*" for strategical purposes can "persuade" in England long.

Well, John, as like as possible to all they read of those wonderful Prophets of old who *acted* in their own persons and lives what they preached, really and truly "theatrical to angels and men," — John, so startling a figure, with such ominous bearing, comes out "in the desert," exhibiting that he believes what he says. But this prodigious man tells of somewhat still more prodigious; and especially, in due time, that he came instructed to "herald" One that was unknown even to him, though expected by all, and expressly to practise one old rite of the very commonest simplicity, that no magic may becloud the clearness of the testimony, *to be attendant for even his own behoof*, that he himself, non-natural as he was, "had not wist Him," but for the evidence thus to be afforded him.

Of course, then, no others knew or "wist." But, Luke iii. 15, "the people WAS shaping an opinion with respect to, and all were dialoguing (*shaping reasons pro and con*) in their hearts about, John, whether he was likely to be The Christ." While all this is so, and "the people" is ready for anything tremendously miraculous, to which John

says he himself is as nothing, and Jesus has lived amongst them for thirty years, and numbers — a generation — had died out, what happens? Suppose further, that John, having pursued his practice these thirty years, then almost ignominiously has his head cut off in the prison, did the popular expectation flag? Had not *Wonder* assumed hereby a sifted, a purer, severer, because simpler, phase than when it blazed away upon Sinai? Surely. For, that all the priests should be enraged, because "the poor had the Gospel preached into them," was, properly, more wonderful than what occurred at Sinai.

They perhaps in their day, as we, too many of us, in ours, expected, like Naaman, the Syrian, that the Prophet would come out to us, or at least "bid us do some great thing"; something, apparently to our idea, proportionate to the great stir that was and is made in the world. Nevertheless, all that John did was to *wash* the people from their fig-leaves and conceits, to upset all pre-conceived notions, to disturb all the reverence for ritual, since he took *all* that came, and in short to derange all that they had learned. And what then? To leave them "baptized in wonder" at *the meaning* of what had gone before, from Moses downwards, ceremonially, from Adam downwards, naturally, to *the meaning* of all that is known and unknown, yet expected and hoped.

And 'what a figure they must have cut,' says the scoffer and the cruel! After exhibiting every "filthy rag of their own justiness and rightiness," to hear John honestly tell them he can do no more for them but bid them expect "One coming after him." And yet, "among them that are born of woman there was never a greater than John the Baptist." He does not haggle nor bother, on the one hand, hampering the people; he does not puff himself up at his waning influence, to keep up his *prestige*; he leaves all, having "taught his disciples to *pray*," that is, to bring *ad orem*, to

the mouth, what is in the "heart," as well as what is uppermost. And to whom did he teach them to "pray," or "confess"? To himself? There "was none greater born of woman" whom he could substitute for himself!

Now this state of *Wonder* is quite supposable to be entirely *natural* up to the application to John. Did that application, or did John, *alter* the natural? Certainly not, according to the record. He wrought upon the natural, startled; he wrought by the natural, attentive and intent; and he wrought indiscriminately in and with the natural; for "the realm of the God is within us" *when natural*, and its insistence doubtful only when we are intoxicated by perverted privileges. These, "the Jerusalemites," are specially named by Mark; and *these* it is, who were baptized under him in the Jordan river," the rest, 'in the desert," according to Mark, whether with or without water he does not say! It ill suffices *now* to say that "baptism" *implies* water-power; for even John himself told of other media, even '*Wonder*,' "Holy Ghost," and "Fire." It seems clear that "water" is not indispensable then.

Section 11.

One may repeat what was said earlier about the *natural* in connexion with Art. IX., that the word *naturæ*, '*nature*,' there used, is really ambiguous, inasmuch as it expresses strictly a *future* of some sort; for the argument dates from the *past*—'*originis*,' "*original*"; and further abets itself by St. Paul's expression, φρονημα σαρκος; which is also a *perf. pass.* = '*intendment of flesh*,' perhaps.

But the very exception implied by the Apostle in the preceding chapter, ver. 18, bespeaks a qualification of ver. 14 (where σαρκινος is the preferred reading, = '*fleshen*,' not

σαρκικος, "*carnal*," *i. e.* '*fleshly*,' or '*fleshlike*'), descriptive of ἐγω, "I." Thus; "for I wist οἶδα, = '*can tell*,' *Item*, there not houses "in me, that is, in my flesh, good," &c., seems to imply that in some other constituent '*of mine*,' not to say *of me*, there may be something of some "good," ἀγαθόν, that is, '*profitable*.' Accordingly he adds, "the to will is lying beside me but [? δε, *and*?] the working the fair, *the beautiful* [τὸ καλὸν], not"; so that "*the mind*," νοῦς, seems to be available at least as a receptive and responsive faculty, and it is to *this* that John appeals by the expression, "baptism of *wonder*."

It is hardly correct to say that even φρῆν, whatever it exactly mean, is so natively vicious; for the Apostle writes φρονημα, and that, too, "of flesh," which is "enmity to God," &c. Now then, that we should be by "*mind*," not to say by "*spirit*," πνευμα (1 Cor. ii. 11), *receptive* or *susceptive*, is surely constitutional, natural, even to the animal, man propagated off of Adam," *or Eve*, or both. Would Art. IX. hold good if the name "*Eve*" were substituted for "*Adam*" there?

For there is another objection, in the use of the word *renatis*, as well as *naturæ* in Art. IX.; and it belongs to the Latin *lapsus*. The very essence of the word *nascor* has *slipped out* of *natus*; and that formula, *sc* = *x*, which would suggest *curiosity* or *enquiry*, is supplanted by the *t*, which precludes all enquiry and substitutes prophecy for it, as the suffix.

The true inflections of the idea which this word means is found in *nanciscor*, *q. d.* *nanaciscor*; which brings out the same *parental* idea that Eve signalized at Gen. iv. 1 by קנה, "I have *kinned* a man"—"*Kin, Quin, Cain.*" The word should be *nactum*, or *naftum*, *naqtum*, or the like; not *natum*. The same holds good with *nox*, *noctis*, *noxius*, up to *noceo*; and *factum*, *feci*, *facio*. And it is greatly to be

observed that the corresponding idea, though generally expressed by the other Apostles by γεννᾶσθαι, as if from the *parental* view, as with Eve, is always conveyed by St. Paul by γινεσθαι, as if a middle or substantive view. That which he especially adopts, as if from the *filial* view, is κτίσις; as of a young '*colonia*' in respect of its *parent* country Here the compound κτ may perhaps originally have been what we found under תם; but at any rate the κ power, or ξ, is certain, and this imparts a *query*, or '*what-is-it?*' power.

Again, when our Lord said, "I am the *bread* which came down from heaven that a man may *eat* thereof," it is undoubtedly implied that a man has the apparatus for eating. The further reason assigned, "eat thereof *and nŏt die*," belongs to *digestion*, which is quite beyond the reach of animal conscious control, naturally; and yet it is a perfectly natural function, even to the extent of '*ruminating*' in some animals — the *legally* "clean." How is it we do not follow out more the thoughts which the very title gives, *Butler's* '*Analogy*,' of a Faculty of '*reflection*' in the sphere of *mind*, analogous to 'rumination' in the sphere of *belly?* If 'rumination' can create indirectly beef and mutton for man, ought not 'reflection' to create indirectly 'wonder' for God? Can we *cognise* a more beautiful and telling picture than that of a child actually *wondering intelligently* at its parent's wisdom?

But there is a still further remark to be made about nascor, natus, corresponding with *gnosco*, *gnotus*. Both these have their *literal* homo-nymes in θνησκω, θνητος, γνωσκω, γνωστος, respectively. Now *natus* for *nactus* we found in *q. d. nanaciscor*, or *nancio*, which means to *get*, or *obtain*, 'especially by accident,' &c. It is also written *nanctus*, and we have also *gnatus;* and the root is said to be γεν for *this* word, though *gnotus* seems to have like claim. The root of

θνησκω is said to be θαν, though we have νεκύς, *nex*, *necis*, at hand, said to have the same meaning. It thus comes to pass, however, that θ = *death*, and γ = *life*, or *birth*, when prefixed to the very same radical words. This may be all true; but it is curious that in very language *gain* should be so nearly *loss*, and *loss*, *gain*.

As to the capability of *nature*, too, not to say *capacity*, in *Homo*, the distinction between "*good*" or *profitable* (*anarthrous*, and therefore may be infinite as indefinite) and "THE fair," or beautiful; the denial of the former "within my flesh," and the proximity of "the to will and not to work" the latter; these distinctions seem quite analogous to those of sex and infancy, not to refer now to *the twins*, Cain and Abel. "The man is not without the woman, nor the woman without the man"; nor the child without the parent; *neither* is "good"-for-aught in the way of their *peculiar* "profit or *good*"; yet each respectively is receptive or susceptive of what is "*beautiful*," suitable, secretly. It seems to me that the Gen. ii. account of the formation of Eve, and the Apostle's argument about the very existence and continuance of the κτίσις, though but "a *rib*," actually ἀπεκδεχεται, *is deductive argument for*, some quality, capability, or faculty, in some way, and that *naturally*. Of course it was *God* that "builded up Eve out of Adam's rib."

This contention for Nature and the natural, which I am maintaining, will be offensive to the educated habit of most English religious minds. It appears to me that the more strenuously they are denied, so much the more is human '*responsibility*' precluded. But is this contention and resistance, respectively, for the sake of one and the same thing? Perhaps not.

It is not easy to establish the duality of *nature* in an individual man; yet such is undoubtedly the fact. We perhaps describe them not inaccurately when we call them a

virile and a fertile "portion"; suppose, then, the virile = the '*moral*' responsive, and the fertile the '*animal*' responsive. Art. IX., by the use of the word *justitia*, "*righteousness*," sometimes "*justification*," although it speaks of "*nature*," and a *vitium et depravatio*, "*fault*, or vice, and *depravity*," really aims its arguments perhaps against man's '*moral*' *exactness*, or "*justitia*"; but this I do not meddle with, except so far as it trenches upon the sphere of *νοῦ*, "*mind*." Granted be it, readily, that all *that should be* masculine, virile, and majestic, is vicious in the extreme. But this only contrasts so much the more with what I do contend for, viz., the most exquisite exactness and aptitude of the *animal*, the fertile, the compliant, the submissive, the susceptive, nay, the very slavish, perfection of the *female* or *fertile ally*. Perhaps reference to Sarah's conduct is like to this; 1 Pet. iii.

This is perhaps what is aimed at by the use of the term *metaphysical*. Yet we have never dreamed of an analogous term — *metanoical*, — though this is really ready to hand, if this could have represented the truth. Why so, except that *νοῦς*, or 'Thought'-faculty, has so vast a range that we have not even suspected its either inner or outer limits; as the common idea of *trans* usually conveys the need of? It may be physiologically contended for that man, constituted of "body, *σῶμα*, *psyche*, 'soul' or life, and spirit," *πνεῦμα* (the first and last being *fixed*, because '*perfect passive*' elements, while the intermediate is *issue of both*), could no more cease *to think* than he can cease *to breathe*. When I say for *psyche*, 'issue of both,' I imply a *Cause* akin *to it* which is mover of the *vehicular* elements, "body" and "*spirit*." This makes the plan of the scheme probably crucial to begin with.

Although then the word *πνεῦμα*, "spirit," is everywhere accepted as the synonyme for רוח, even in Gen. i. 1, yet such

a passage as that which opens John iv. 24 surely suggests the poverty of language; and consequently the inadequacy of our *mind* to apprehend truth.

A similar argument too is suggested respecting σῶμα, "*body*," compounded as it evidently is from σαος, σαωζω, σωζω, = *saved-ment*; and yet that it perishes. True, it has served a purpose, an occasion, has afforded an opportunity; and having fulfilled these for a certain term of χρονος, time, delay, or years, it richly deserved that very *name*, though it then be ejected; but therefore for *another* occasion — *recuperation*; see Rom. viii. 23, *fin.* 1 Cor. xv. 35–38, &c.

When, then, such vehement denial as Art. IX. seems to afford to those who urge it with still greater vehemence and larger range, is so obtruded on our regard, in despite of the fact that man still "lives, and moves, and is in being," are we not pressing on subjects which we can know no more about than we can of the 'Nature' of God Himself"? I conceive that the former must be referrible wholly to the idea *of privilege*, and to the misuse of privilege through our *idea of it*; but what of the latter? To *have* a *privilege* is a mighty thing; to claim its belongings into and within its *ex-tremes* is tremendous, in the sphere we are presuming to discuss. Do we see living witnesses of such tremendousness at all frequent in the world? If so, surely they are the most beautifully natural.

Because, when we say, in our beautiful prayer, "We *thank* Thee (which implies that we *have recognised*, and *acknowledged*) for our Creation, Preservation, and all the blessings of this life; but above all," &c., we assuredly recognised *privilege in the par* which we have not exhausted by our disparagement of it. And yet some seem to unreflectingly read the "but above all" as if the premisses *at par* were of small if any importance, *the super* being truthfully so engrossing. It seems already to be overlooked that the

very maintenance of the premisses *at par* is the subject matter of "the redemption," and that the "price" paid FOR THAT was The Christ! We thus become educated to soar away into the sublime, as we do by our prevailing language into 'to-morrow,' not reflecting that '*over and above*' cannot be, unless *the par* first consist to the full, and *then run over*; nor 'to-morrow' be ever conceivable to any present purpose, unless "To-day" be first fully perceived.

Now I conceive that there is here utterly a departure from the New Testament mode of teaching, and interpretation of *two* Tables of "the Law."

The natural θυμία, as the effect of ἐντολη—*very Instinct*, will be perhaps taken as matter of course; it does not need to be 'granted' by either party, teacher or taught. There it is, as θυμία, *q. d. appetency*, in every 'animal' that exists; but it flags, as with *satiety*, at mere *sufficiency*. This is the explanation of Eden-scene; things were '*slow*,' and there was "*waste*," φθορα, Rom. viii. 20—say, of energy, ardour, time, &c. The danger is represented by the *warning caution* in Eden, "lest"; the issue is expressed by St. Paul's ἐπι-prefix, taken out of "*the* law." It is the impatient *capping* the θυμία into ἐπιθυμία, which, when "the law was given by Moses," was directly *prohibited*. For even in Eden, "all the trees of the garden," surely ample and varied enough for more than sufficiency, *did not suffice;* and though all Creation shewed the importance of successions of "times and seasons," and therefore of 'rules and regulations,' the *one test* was disregarded, and the immature ἐπι-, or *capping* act, which crowned, overbalanced, the already *more than full*, if possible, *toppled all over*. Thus impatience and impetuosity appear to be the fault. Finally, *Homo* is "expelled" with its "fig-leaves" on; and although previously to the expulsion he is further "covered with coats of skins," the *Homo wears* them, *carries* the former out of the garden.

Why then, the *Homo* with his θυμία, as Θυμος, is not the mere *humus* which was only one constituent. Not only so, but with his memorial of επιθυμία clinging about him he is our great natural Progenitor, "*Adam* + *Eve*," '*male* + *female*." *That*, then, is our 'Nature'; but *before* we were expelled, and *became* "subjected *by* or *to* the fatuity" of, or by, the κτισ-*ing*, or *severalizing* process, we were further *privileged* — "covered with coats of skins"; and then a guard is placed so that we should not perpetuate so disastrous a state of things "for ever." Much of this has been afloat under various guises from long pre-historic times. Now all this was precedent for the further and after 'Peculiars' or Privileged; the Noahs, the Abrahams, the Moseses, the Jews. And "the law" of the latter could not abrogate "[the] law" latent or patent in and after Eden; neither could the latter dis-appoint "Law," which had controlled before Adam was created, according to the Record, and Natural Evidence.

Utrum vel quidlibet mavis, then; not John the Baptist, nor Jesus, nor Paul, could have deemed their Gospel suitable for *nobodies*, nor for stocks and stones. But they *did* address it to somebodies suited to it, even our forefathers and us. How then, and in what terms?

John's we have here partially examined. Jesus's may be anticipated by His surprise at Nicodemus's wonder or "marvel." But see Paul's, at Lystra, Acts xiv., by *the natural*. Especially see him at Athens, Acts xvii. 22, 23; here he, as on a very premiss which cannot be gainsaid, "perceives" even *their rational* "religion," and claims it as a trophy of Natural Law. So in his Epistle to the Romans. In i. 17, he tells that "the Gospel of the Christ" "reveals an exactness of God," = a severe exactness, existing from the first, and cognizable by man; neither weak and puny on the one hand, nor cruel and unjust on the

other; but he says that *elsewhere* "there is revealed a terrible wrath to, or upon, all indifference and injuriousness of men that are suppressing, holding down, keeping back, in injuriousness — THE TRUTH"; that is, what is perfectly plain. And he goes on to argue the *true, plain, manifest* force of *natural* 'Religion'; and how the non-natural degenerated into the 'unnatural.'

So that by the time he comes to chap. ii., as we have often quoted, he confronts the highly privileged Jew, with what by Nature not only *can* be done, but *is* done — even "the work of *the* Law," which was the Jew's *peculiar* code. How can this be, is the implied corollary, but that there is a profounder "Law" which the Jews and you have ignored? If so, that "Law" had *subjects*.

Being so, or anything approaching this, it is explicable how that the privileged in all ages, being therefore peculiarly liable to intoxication, have actually become preternaturally intoxicated, "puffed up"! *Their* danger is greater than other men's, as was Adam's and Eve's than any of their children's. How repeatedly does Paul especially, warn against this very danger! But whom does he so warn? The ἀγαπητοι, "the *beloved-ables*"; those whom it is quite *probable are* "beloved"; but still *not certain!* The word is quite different from ἀγαπημενοι, that is, '*the being beloved.*'

Again; natural *Wonder*, as the = of μετανοία, is not a thing which grows in magnitude as by *accumulation*, like 'Sphynxes,' 'Pyramids,' and the grandeur of the East, North, South, and even West. It now grows *intimately*, grows in *intensity;* "having eyes *within*," rather than "eyes without," which apprehend the objective. But has it ever been duly noticed how *beautiful* a feature of Human Nature it is to even *Idolize* the byegone *into the Vast?* Or, on the other hand, what a proneness there is in hot-housed Humanity to *Idolize* the preferential into *the Monstrous?* There is

insisting, an equivalent to some profound 'propension' of Human Nature and Divine Law underlying all this, surely. I know that this is admitted vaguely sometimes; but generally it is virtually denied.

Recurring, then, to the order of the words about the Natural, at Rom. i. 17, observing that ἀσεβεία comes first; that is, indifference, 'too much trouble' to *cultivate*, disregard. *This is* what the Apostle takes up in chap. ii., addressed to "O man"; — or "despisest thou the wealth," &c. And he grandly amplifies his argument — to man *as man*.

But he next names ἀδικία, *injuriousness*, the *damage* that is done. It is indeed annexed to the former, even copulated; but he takes us throughout the Epistle to the Jew for a picture of the exaggeration to see the damage. The copula imports that both *natural*, Pagan or Gentile, and privileged, the Jew, are given to "suppress or hold back or keep down the truth," — I think the Apostle would have been glad of the modern dreadful word '*reticent*' to express his idea, — to *reticulate* the Truth, make a *mesh* of it, make a "*sin*" of it; but the *damage* done to something or somebody he nails fast to the Jew, quoting the reports of their Prophets of old; chap. ii. 24. What a false-pattern to the Gentile and the Pagan from God then, is the Jew and the Ceremonialist as an '*excuse*' for other men to God! Yet they are the 'privileged.'

If we confuse these two lines of argument we utterly mar this grand Epistle. Luther took the Epistle to the Galatians as his armoury against Rome; but some bigger than Luther will come some day and take up this Epistle to the Romans against Rome and the World. The place from whence this Epistle is 'dated' is "Corinth"; most appropriately, for it was the seat of "wisdom" and learning. Rome at that time was in the big boorish state; all that was *elegant* was

in Greece; but yet *the Big* was Conqueror, Emperor! Is it to be so again? Are numbers and Bigness always to be the last resort?

Now I say all the procedure of God with man was reiteratively harbingered to Elias. After thunder, whirlwind, earthquake, &c., comes the "still small voice"; and *there* was the Power. And the petulant peevishness of this great Prophet must have been astounded with the declaration — "Yet I have left [? εγκατελίπα] to Myself 7,000 men that have not bowed the knee to Baal," though even you are too great a man to have noticed or even known them! Some of the Apostles urged the same thing on our Lord; — "but we forbad them, because they follow not us." Most weighty was His reply; "forbid them not; for no one is there who shall do ability [*create a miracle*, or *possibility*] upon My name and will be able quickly to have cacologized Me." The annexed verse should be wonderful in these days!

But it is this "*quickly* able," like Elijah's "still small voice" experience; — or Job's "sweet influences of the Pleiades," and the like; or Jacob's "blessings of the everlasting hills"; — "the dews of heaven" of the Prophets generally; the regular and routinelike beauty of "the morning spread upon the mountains"; — it is this, and these, which the Apostle asks, demands, καταφρονεῖς — "*dost thou intend against?* Dost thou mean to *plead excuses against* such 'trifles'? — such vulgar, supererogatory, things? St. James is right here when he urges that "works put the finish upon belief." This word, καταφρονειν, is unhappily translated in E. V. "*despised*," at a most important place which mars the whole truth; Heb. xii. 2, "having *intended against* shame." Our blessed Lord as "a son of man" by no means "*despised*" it, either the cross or its shame; but He was "*intent against*" them. This has a most important bearing on the argument I would urge here.

Section 12.

And now to advance; deliberately if we can.

Since John then came heralding a "Baptism of *Wonder*," which was to be the result of the innucleation of *νοΐα*, as *Thought;* and since John was such a prodigy as men saw, and Isaiah and Malachi had foretold; it is implied that men do not 'half nor quarter' *think*. The mind's outward eyes are wide open for "any new thing," from hangings to 'excommunications'; but the inner eyes!—Well; whether the mind be cheated or no by preoccupation through those outward eyes' reports, (— since a man can but be *occupied*. It was all our Saviour urged — "Occupy, till I come";) — or by the sleepiness of "night-time," or from any other cause, the Apostle urged that in the state and condition to which Human Nature ["Gentiles"] has been subjected by the fatuity of the mind," the cause or reason is that it is "darkened by the imagination, being made a foreigner from the life of the God along of the *ἀγνοια*, or *absence-of-giving Thought, thoughtlessness,* that being in them along of the porousness, *filter-likeness,* of the heart," which retains the dregs but loses the juices and æthers of a would-be benefice. Here then we have a perfect cumulus of reasons or belongings, why Human Nature is befooled, and how. Call it 'stupidity' if you will, that is, 'worse than nothing'; but do not so highly exalt yourself or your position as to deem it despicable. *Think* it so you cannot; but the "easy" and "self-satisfied" do not 'half or quarter' *think* any more than "the other Gentiles." Have even these then ever *really wondered?*

I feel impelled to argue with these, the privileged, because they are therefore the most salient and even saltatory. The naturals, the Pagans, the Gentiles, do not dispute matters of this kind; they are "far advanced" in a *down-*

ward direction which is the "way" for a man to "the kingdom of heaven." But these aspirants puzzle us all; they "climb up some other way" apparently "by their fruits." And yet I feel I stand no chance with them in casuistry or argument. My handle is the natural; and I would strive to keep to it.

How then can the — *not fatuous*, mind, though it be "subjected *to*, or *by, the fatuity*," its owner "being darkened by the imagination," *think to the amount of Wonder?* Evidently by nothing from without, since Imagination, which divides or pierces mind, is a Darkener of the Person who is the mind. The other great items which Paul here enumerates and accumulates, John did not assail. But he did assail the Imagination in a very extraordinary manner, in person, practice, heralding, and sermon. He must have broken through the darkening veil of self-satisfaction somewhat; he could bear to be laughed at. He must have reached the feelings, heart somewhat, "porous" as it is, since he not only set folks a-thinking, but they all came to him to be "baptized." But was *this* believing!

And while he did thus actually "baptize in water," he virtually counted it no baptism at all, any more than their mockery anything; because there was nothing wonderful in baptism to a Jew, and it was rather ridiculous, if not insulting to the Naamans about him. To a Jew, however, any new *ultra*-baptism "unto remission of sins" should have been insulting too, because *ultra*-canonical. Yet this was to be the issue of the Baptism which he proclaimed.

Wonderful even within the Canons; most wonderful without. No amount of *thinking*, even within the Canons, argues Paul, could effect this so as to exactly square with conscience and consent, *even* aided by canonical ritual; "*belief*" was still the Instrumental, wanting which all was fruitless or worse.

It was, however, necessary to *argue* the failure of all that high Ritual, even in the matter of "belief," even with "Cephas, James, and John"!

All this then, even from the drowning of a world down to Egyptian and Babylonish bondage, having failed, deliverances therefrom having proved futile, John proclaims, heralds, another tack. He begins with the trumpery farce, as the Naamans would think it, of *sham-drowning*. But he tells them of One coming after him who will "work wonders," as far above all that their Imagination or Memory can reach, as this ritual *farce* of his is below. He simply heralds and foretells it; he does not caricature it; but he does most severely satirize all like it that they had trusted in. And it is still to "men" a satire upon credulity, "so long as the first tabernacle has stasis."

And how does John set about brewing the Bath for this "Baptism of *Wonder*"? He "heralds, 'leging, '*wonder*' ye, for neared has the kingdom of the heavens!" *Matt.* "Heralding baptism of '*wonder*' into departure of sins," *Mark* and *Luke*. Then, after the having baptized, "on the morrow, —— Behold the Lamb of the God, he bearing the 'sin' of the world!" ver. 29; again, ver. 37, "Behold the Lamb of the God!" *John*. Thus, having excited all *thought* and every expectation, leaving them a night to brood over it, then "on the morrow, Behold! —— the Lamb of the God." The word is in the singular, "Behold *thou*"; but even the synonyme is feeble; for the Greek ἴδε is genuine Hebrew, and means *feel*, '*tell*,' by any and every sense or faculty thou hast. The word is wonderfully well rendered by LXX. in Gen. iii., where "the tree *of knowledge*," is τοῦ εἰδέναι τὸ γνωστὸν, "the tree of *the having felt what can be known*."

And what is it they do "behold"? A man; a registered Jew, and registered too in the Roman registry also, along

with his legitimatized parents. He is a man of "about thirty years of age." John has baptized Him, after a scruple, which, perhaps, no others knew of, or but few at any rate. John's apostrophe is remarkable, as if it were said to himself; as much as to say, "This, then, is He." For his instructions were, i. 33, "upon whom thou mayest haply behold [ἴδῃς] the Spirit descending and staying upon Him, This is He baptising in Holy Spirit." But John himself was miraculous as to his origin, as well as being a wonder and a prodigy. Whoever, therefore, may have heard this from John, to him the Wonder would be more wonderfully simple than baptism in water by John. This, however, is just the Wonder of wonders that the Ritualist cannot see; for it is "the altar whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle." It was seen or "beheld" into by comparatively a very few, even while "He went about doing good, and healing all manner of sicknesses, and all sorts of disease — and gospelled the poor"; which last seems to have been the profoundest pitch of perfection. Nor shall *we* "behold" it until we come to this Wonder with somewhat more wonder than even John's wondering eyes could tell even him! "Such as caught the true light, or 'took *Fire*,' It gave to them ex-istence that bairns of God came to be, to those believing into Its name, who, not out of bloods [*of descent?*], nor out of willed-ment [or *wishedment*] of flesh, nor out of willed-ment [*wishedment*] of male man [ἀνδρος], but out of God were gendered ["*born*"]," John i. 12, 13.

Section 13.

These are too decisive words to tamper with in any hope of garbling them so as to procure a *manufacturing* process out of them. There are, however, one or two points which may be instanced. Be it remembered that we are at

Wonder; and here is φῶς, "Light," *or Fire, "the truthen Light,"* or Fire.

1. Some '*catch* it,' or 'take fire,' 'get *a-light.*'

2. "It gives to them ex-istence ἐξουσια, that bairns of God 'come to pass," to them believing into Its name." As Isaiah says, *they are "with child";* having been impregnated, "believing into Its name"; but nothing is said, as in Isaiah, about "*bringing forth,* wind," or aught else.

3. The word rendered "came to be," or "came to pass," is γεν-; the word rendered "*gendered*" (or E. V. "*born*") is γενν-. The former word furnishes all we understand by 'Genesis,' the title of the first Book of the Bible. So here the gift of ex-istence (compare the "*ex-stasis*" of Adam, when "God took out one of his ribs") is such that "a bairn of God is *genesis'd* to those believing into The Light's name." But, γενν-, "they were *kinned what they are,* out of God," "being *genesis'd* bairns of God" already; that is, before they are "builded up of God into Eves," or, "*kinned.*"

Our English word "*born,*" much more correctly is confined to τίκτω, that word which gives "*bairns*" — the same word — to avoid confusion. Collate this word τι-κτ-ω, τε-κν-ον, τε-קק, with what is above said on πιπισκω, and hereafter on πιϛις. No doubt Nature furnishes a complete analogy; but even that is far too great a Wonder for our comprehension. Yet, is it unlikely, is it impossible, that the greater wonder, because more intimate and individual, and '*whole,*' may be more approachable "*by belief*"?

As to γεν- and γενν-, I have followed St. John's *ordo;* but perhaps the *syntax* implies that in truth γενν- precedes γεν-; neither, however, strictly means "*born,*" except in that high sense as when "Levi paid tithes in *Abraham,*" and not in *Sarah.* In that high sense, too, "bairns of God *begin to be,*" γεν-, and are given ἐξουσια, or *existence,* forasmuch as "believing into His name." The γενν- seems

attempted, as we before said, in *nanaciscor*," *q. d.* ; and so υἱοὶ may agree with γενν-; while τεκνα, as here, agrees with γεν-. For I do not think that υἱος can be at all satisfactorily referred to φύω, and *fui* from *feo;* and the two words, υἱος and τεκνον, are by no means used promiscuously.

But it is more especially to be observed that the participial form, "*believing,*" has a *quasi* causal, as well as the word itself here a conditional, meaning; and that this, only in the order of narration, follows on upon ἐξουσιαν and γενεσθαι; the οἱ γενν-, as before said, preceding both. All, however, *dates* from their "*catching*" fire, or "light"; so that the Prime Wonder is this *objective* "true Light."

Now the narration gets a pause as it were in the next sentence; "And [*Accordingly?* καὶ, Heb. ii. 14] The Logos flesh became, γεν-, "or *begun to be,* and tabernacled [? ἐσκηνωσεν; comp. 2 Cor. v.] in us." The very mention of "the Logos" takes us up to ver. 1; and at Rev. xix. 13, written by the same writer, we read who "was called" thus.

This takes our mind far back; as we saw, Solomon, in Prov. viii., writing under the name "Wisdom," חכמה, LXX. σοφια, diving into the Heights. Perhaps John's apostrophe "on the morrow" is of the same high character, when he says, "the Lamb of the God"; and St. Luke the same with the angel's words to Mary, i. 35, in a more "neighbourly" relation.

But John's expression, "*the Lamb,*" and from the mouth of John the very penultimate *q. d.* of the ceremonial law, implies *a Victim;* according to all the Types from the beginning. It is in this view that the words of Solomon (Prov. viii. above quoted) about "Wisdom" are so significant; particularly ver. 22; and as when Rev. xiii. 8 say, "slain from before the downthrow of the world." Compare 1 Pet. i. 19, 20. It is this which seems to make the whole scheme appear puerile, because so *quasi* tentative. Yet this really is its

primal grandeur; that we, but the outcasts of the Original, as some think, should possess, *by any Means*, the ability to "work out our own safetery" *ourselves*. We don't admire that God wants *us to do it*, and furnishes us with the very *chances* of so doing, — *at a cost*, as it is cosmically represented.

Although the most usual word in "the Law" for "*lamb*" is כבש; yet Fürst says of this, "*a young sheep*, after it has ceased to be טלה a *lamb*." Under this last word he suggests θαλλ-ω; but by Gesenius's observation, which I have found good reason to adopt, ט = τ, not θ; according to which the more suitable reference is to τλαω; מלל, I. Perfect for perfect as in Hebrew we must read τετληται; there is no 'present' τλαω met with; this is supplied from τολμαω. Thus it is this word טלה, so interpreted by the Greek, which brings out all that seems to be wanted to sketch the great picture of *the Person*—"the Christ." The passages just referred to are briefly conceptive of all that Solomon makes "Wisdom" address to "*her sons*"; and the Hebrew '*perfect*,' τε-τλη-ται, טלה, names the advent of One upon a career of "suffering" and "endurance," ὑπομονη, and "learning obedience, ὑπακοη, by the things which he suffered, being a son," and "being to begin with in form, μορφη, of God." So Peter; "a lamb faultless, and spotless, 'Christ,' being pro-gnosed indeed before down-throw of Cosmos."

All this, however, absolutely, is remote from us; St. Paul brings it more *home* to us by this very word, τολμαω. Not but that St. Peter too, in that very passage even, says that "we can *tell* that we were ransomed by the precious blood of *that very* Lamb"; just as St. Paul to the Corinthians says, "He is our Pascha"; and, "for even our Pascha over us was ἐτύθη, Christ," — "*sacrificed*," E. V. This word, thus derived from θυω, whence θυσια, &c., affords little explanation, except to Jews, unless as recognising a very ancient

religious rite; and yet it is evident from the context that the Apostle intended to avow it to the Greeks at Corinth. But read from ver. 6, that *even* a "little leaven" is to be the object of search; is to be "purged out," all ritual terms, well understood by Jews as the process of *legal cleansing;* "for," says he, "even our Pascha over us was 'suspected,' *Christed-able.*" Clearly these Greeks are expected to understand all the allusion. The close corresponsiveness between τυ/θ, and τυ/χ of τυγχανω can hardly be doubtful; as in *tot, quot,* τοσος, ποσος, &c. So that, as τυχ means "*hit,*" or '*spotted,*' to use an Americanism, perhaps even חם, so we may suppose τυθ somewhat nearly like *hic, hoc, huj*-us, a kind of "this *fellow,*" as the exasperated and be-savaged Jews repeatedly said of Jesus to His face! or, as Pilate, "Behold *the man!*" It is the terminal of the first etymon thus referred to.

Homer uses the word τυχ as the very complement of ἡμβροτες; "thou '*sinned'st,*' spotted'st, and *hitted'st*" him. Here, by our explanation, which is also supported by the *Name's* consisting of the *verbal in* -τ-ός, and the terminal θ, in τυθ-, instead of χ in τυχ-, it suggests that even *the doubtful,* the being only *probable,* and therefore *suspiciable,* like "a *little* leaven," makes "the whole mass" 'unclean,' in legal '*exactness,*' and therefore objectionable.

It is thus too I read that great passage at 2 Cor. v. *ult.,* bringing *home* to us the highest flight of our conception. "God was in 'Christ' — whom scarcely having known [γνοντα] 'sin,' over us 'sin' He made, 'created,' *him.*" I do not meddle with the terms further than to shew my argument.

But while that may come home to *reason* and Greek "wisdom," as resolving the matter into the High Wisdom of the High Arbiter as well as Despot — an "unknownable God"; later on perhaps, that is, to *the Romans,* to whom, in his

Epistle, he deals so largely with *the natural*, he reasons thus by natural affection. Rom. v. 6, "For yet [ἔτι or *still*] Christ, we being strengthless, opportunely over indifferent [*uncultured*] ones 'died' away. For wholly [*utterly* = *barely*] over right-y [or *adverbial exactitude*, δικᾰ-ον] will any one die away, for over the good [or *profit, advantage*] *so to be hoped for it is that* quickly any one even *dares*, τολμα, *ventures*, טלה, -τλη-, makes a *lamb or victim of himself*, even to have died away; consist too the -of-Himself love into us does the God, *Item*, yet, or *still*, "sinners" we being, Christ over us died away."

The pure *reasoning* in this passage is most cumulative from two divergent postulates into one convergent Focus which is the *daring, venturing*, τολμᾰ. The postulates are "the good" probably derivable or accruable out of a Thing of *tributive exactness*, a subjective, 'understood' or '*subscriptable*,' exactness, that is everywhere to be looked for in the shape and name of χαρις, "*grace*," *gratitude;* and this as trust, would be the other postulate, even from the standpoint of *natural affection; e. g.*, '*De profundis clamavi.*'

But the passage out of the Epistle to Corinthians, appealing to Greek "wisdom" by this *natural Reason*, ascends to the sublime. The Apostle writes — "made or *created* Him 'sin,' so that we may come to be, or *become*, or *be genesis'd*, the right-iness, *justi-ness, exacti-ness* of God in Him." This is not to be read as if 'we may *become in Him* the δικ. of God'; but "*God-in-Him*" being the clause we started from, (where the substantive verb "*was*," ἦν, is required to set out with,) as the Q. E. D. — this formula is the *Postulate*, of which "*we* may become *axiomatic* Demonstrators." Happy "the wise whom He is dragging in their own craft." Even they cannot but come to '*Wonder*,' even of very *Mind, Thought.*

To return to טלה, τλη, "*the Lamb.*" When he sent forth

"the 70," He said to them, "Behold, I send you forth as *sheep* into the midst of wolves"; will ye *venture? dare* ye? Then, "be ye wise as serpents and harmless as doves." But here is John recognizing, or "wisting" the *Lamb* of the God, "apostled," "sent." He does not recognize the "young bullock that hath horns and hoofs," but "*the Lamb*," that is the *darer*, the *venturer*. Hence the voice after His baptism (under John that they "becomingly fulfil all exacti-ness" which the Law has utilized), "This is the Son of Me, the belov'd-able, in whom I well-opined"; Matt. iii. 17, — that the "wolves" may hear it and be 'thunder-struck.' And on other occasions too.

And so after three years of Divine Beneficence and "fair opinion among men," *in general*, early in which "John is beheaded in the prison," and severity upon him, too, is translated into rancour in the Priesthood and their satellites, *the 'peculiar,'* — "*He* finishes" the Law; Col. ii. 14, 15.

For many centuries now have the once vivid "memorials" of This been representatived among us, less bloodily indeed than among the Jews in the tabernacle ritual; but — where is now the Wonder? It is surely a hopeless business, as well as a damaging, to attempt by "signs and wonders" of man's devising to kindle a benevolent Wonder in us now. Because mind-wonder, thought-wonder, 'was almost no where' while a sensuous ritual held sway by Divine appointment; is it hoped, now when mind-wonder, thought-wonder, have almost vanished and been supplanted by 'indifference,' that the sensuous can eke out something beneficial? — that sensuous too being "manufactured" by the behests of 'Early Church,' as is opined; while the former was avowedly, creditably "manufactured" by Moses under God, and yet failed? More hopeful far I believe to take up Paul's instructions, even almost, if not quite, *exclusively*; except that he is too *natural* to be exclusive of any unless the *non-natural*.

Section 14.

But let us see the first Public instance of *Wonder*, as recorded in Acts ii. I purposely pass over Acts i. for the present. Nay; before! we take that great jump, or make that *facile descensus averni*, let us "Behold," as even *Pilate* bids us!

We saw in the Epistle to Ephesians, that *naturally* we "walk in fatuity of our mind, being darkened by the 'Imagination,'" or that which distracts or pierces through our mind. This is a simpler state or estate, than is described in chap. ii. 2, 3, "children of non-suasion, non-suavity," unfaith, &c., forasmuch as preoccupied already. So of the former, accrediting them to be *natural*, in chap. i. 18, he writes of "the eyes of their Imagination being lighted, or having been *fired*, unto the *telling*," or "that we *wist*," so and so. But this εἰδέναι, by *fired* Imagination, is other than "knowing by the *mind*," γνο-. So to the Corinthians he writes, "God who bade the light, or *fire*, to shine out of the dark, shone in our HEARTS, to give the light or *fire* of," &c.

These three separate stages, or estates, are most marked in this Epistle; but we lose all the argument, when we confuse them. It is very plain that we are on the track of a different Wonder, or *Iterated* Wonder, than Mind- or Thought-Wonder. But, "behold," it is to *the naturals* that he speaks of "the hope of His call"—κλήσις. This reminds one of the "far advanced, ye poor in Spirit"; and, "*how hardly* the rich folks, *how difficultly*, they enter into the kingdom of heaven;" and of 1 Cor. i. 26, &c. It would seem that "Ideolatry" was even the *natural* 'propension' from the beginning; while Idolatry is a copying in wood or stone of the "imagery" of the Mind, the Wonderful, that John warns us against at his outset—"No one has seen God

anyhow, or ever." *Thus* Imagination gathered from Mind—that vast indefinite "chamber of imagery," and its gatherings were but notional and unsubstantial, not truly *Ideal.*

But *here*, the very same Faculty, the 'Imagination,' 'having eyes,' becomes competent "unto the *having told* us what the hope of His call [κλησις] is, and," other great things. "The Light" or *Fire, fires* the eyes of our Imagination unto our "catching fire" or "*light*" (St. John's expression) or the "having *told*," *felt, sensed* — what this is. This is Wonder to the natural; and *so remains to the end,* with varying vividness, 'Wonder,' to the natural; but a thing of course, in course, in the cursus of things, to "the self-sufficient or self-satisfied," αὐταρκείοις. *They* "have got their reward" from some bye-law, from some '*peculiar*' spring. "But not so learned ye the Christed-able," says Paul in another place. "Homologesis of sins," "rags" of fig-leaves, "coats of skins to clothe us," given to us for the purpose by "the Lord God," are not discovered nor reached in this "way"; they are to be "gotten" nevertheless.

Now the reciprocal or reciproque to the argument and counter-postulate which closes 2 Cor. v., above adduced is, that as "God in Christ" is the one Truth, "we in Christ" is the *iterate* of it. But he deduced this from his premiss, 'if any one be in Christ he is a new κτισις," or "*rib*," as in Adam's case. But this again was a "wherefore" from a previous premiss; namely, that "if one died away over all, verily the *said* all died away." That is, if the "one" be "*over* all," "the all" must be *under* the one; and this, he says, is the result of his deliberate "judgment." The question arises then, and it is not merely curious, Can there be *a death* real to the "Imagination" as that Faculty pierces the Mind with darkened "eyes," separable from a death seen by the same Faculty piercing with "eyes" enlightened which reaches the heart — the animal affections, the animal *vitals?*

It is even so; a "second death" implies a first; a "second resurrection" implies a first. We can scarcely even '*mind*,' or *think* of that first great θα-, or θαν-, which Solomon divined in Prov. viii. = about "Wisdom," because we are so little struck with the second θα-, or θαν, which the same Person made on the cross at Calvary; yet He was "in form of God to begin with." We are tied to regard ourselves as "being in *form* of man to begin with," and yet we are *sure* that we are *far short of a man*.

Now the former was "our Example"! We have to become copies of it! "See that thou make everything according to the Pattern that was shewed to thee in the mount." Our "life" of threescore years and ten, — antecedences being unknown, — has its parallel, short indeed, in the so many 'centuries' of eternity, in which, "from everlasting," "Wisdom" was "boothed," סכה, or "*So-That-ed*" or "*So-The-'d*," as the "Go-Amidst of God and Man." And a Mind-death at the least in us, must answer to that. The "degradation" or "subjection" natural of the Body, is but a bare reciprocal to His liberation, or emancipation from his Relict on the Cross. But, if with us, the death of *the body* be the *first* death, and a "second" is inevitable, what must *that* "second death" be, but a going to *howl* "to the spirits in prison" even as He "went and preached in the days of Noah"?

Now, whatever that θα-ν, *i. e.*, "*death*," may be, yet since in the higher sphere it set Angels wondering and enquiring, we may be sure that in *our lower sphere* it is not *only Imaginative* nor *Imaginary*. It is that which both in Epistle to Rom. v. and 2 Cor. v. is termed καταλλαγη *in its result*; that is, a '*thorough alteration*' of real state, from that state of which, in respect of us, he says, Eph. ii. 1, "we were DEAD, νεκρους, by the trespassments and the 'sins.'" This last passage, as referred to us, is I believe ill rendered in

E. V.; and the interpolation in italics, as well as the separation into a new chapter, misrepresents. From i. 18 read; "unto the having sensed you [or *you having sensed*] what the hope of His call is, what the wealth — and what the overthrown *overwhelming* [*i. e. enveloping*] greatness of His ability [*possibility*] unto us that are believing according to the energy [*in-working*] of the grasp [κράτος] of His strength, which *energy* He energied [*in-worked*] in the Christ, having aroused Him out of (*the*) dead [νεκρῶν], and seated Him — and subjected all under His feet, and given Him *as* head over all, *to* or *by*, the Church and (given) Him YOU, being dead, νεκροὺς, by the trespassments and the sins in which formerly ye walked according to the Constant of this world ——among [*sons*] whom also WE all were turned away [*aversioned*]; —— the God, too [δὲ], wealthy being in mercy, —— US also, while being dead [ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς] *by* the trespassments, He covivified *by* the Christ."

Note; "given Him head, — and *you*, — and *us*"; and note the *reason* or *cause participially* implied; "and, or *even*, you forasmuch as ye are dead, — and forasmuch as us dead." What the change of *ordo* imports — ὑμᾶς ὄντας — ὄντας ἡμᾶς — is not quite easy to state; but it is evidently considerable, though both *are* "*dead*." The "*you*" is the first objective in the first instance, and unconditional; but the "*forasmuch as being*," is the first objective in the second instance, as if *the conditional*. The "*you*" is the *natural fact*, but is expounded by ὄντας ν-, = "you *though being dead* by the bye-faults and the 'sins'"; the second is, the ὄντας = "*forasmuch as being*, or *while being*, us dead by the bye-faults." The passage at Gal. ii. 19–21, further explains this. But, further, why not add in the *second* instance "by the bye-faults *and by the sins*," as is in the first instance? Because there has been an ἄφεσις or *discharge* of them; as John "heralded" there should be in the case of certain "*us*";

and as here the opening of chap. i. brings out by the term υἱοθεσια, "*sonship.*"

For mark, that this great "energy energied" even "in the Christ" in very deed, "forasmuch as it aroused Him out of dead *ones.*" Thus it is that He is not only πρωτοτοκος, "First-born of the dead ones," nor only "my πρωτος, *First,*" as John said, but is "in all Himself πρωτευων, *First-ing*"; Col. i. So here, throughout, the being "*dead*" is the *postulated,* because the essential indispensable preliminary condition; *then,* "He, the Energy, co-vivifies us to or by the Christ." Compare Rom. v. and 2 Cor. v. as above, and we find that the *realisation* of this state of νεκρωσις itself, is the beginning of that *great alteration,* καταλλαγη, which he so desiderates. It is no mere 'spiritual,' but an *actual,* to be FINALLY a *factual,* 'thorough alteration.'

For although he thus repeatedly and emphatically calls "us" and "you" "*dead,*" νεκρους, yet, forasmuch as "God is the God not of the dead, νεκρων, but of the living," therefore this "death" must be *peculiar* but real,—'*spiritual* death' is what it is theologically called,—that the term καταλλαγη may comprise ζωη, as the alternative. But at Rom. xii. 1 he says "offer your *bodies*"; so again 1 Cor. vi. 20, "have gloried the God in your *body,*"—the rest of the verse is spurious; as if it were the ψυχη—"*soul,*" "*life*"—*Self?* which is "*altered*" from "*dead.*" But see further on 1 Cor. xv. hereafter.

This word καταλλαγη is in E. V. sometimes "*reconciliation,*" sometimes "*atonement*"; and we have come to think that *God* needs "reconciling" *to us!* that He must be "pacified to us"! The word actually meaning "thorough *change* or *alteration*" is properly enough demanded of *us,* but quite out of place with respect to God; "For I am God"; "I *change* not." The parable of the Prodigal too figures the state of the case, as a "having come to himself." Thus Rom. v. 8,

"Item, still 'sinners' being us," that is, "*forasmuch as*, or *though*, being"; ver. 10, "for IF enemies being we were thoroughly altered *to*, or *by*, the God"; that is, "*forasmuch as*, or *though*, being." Here, evidently, "*sinners*" and "*enemies*," ἁμαρτ. ἐχθρ. are used as synonymous, or at least convertible, terms. But by this place in Eph. we see that they are not necessarily convertible, though they may be synonymous; and this is why the addition, above enquired about, is omitted in Eph. "and *by the sins*."

Now the fact is that in ἐχθρ, we have the very Hebrew root-word for "*sin*," חט modified. And how modified? By Gesenius, the Greek should be χτ; separately, or together, these are symbols of high *commercial* significance as "*signs*" or "*marks*"; changed into *f*, and ς, often by some nations, and into ט by the Jews. But then that was + or ×, the old Egyptian *Tau*; it is notable too how near the Chaldean symbol ט approaches to the ט. Yet the ט of חט, should be τ, not θ; and we can readily suppose the aspirate in εχθρος to be derived from the *half vowel* ρ, which is always ῥ. The word ἑτερος is fully preserved; by like abbreviation it would be ἑθρος for ἑθερος. Both words have the *look* of a grammatical 'comparative *degree*' as to their terminations; yet the idea of *degree* is not the thing; that of *gender* is more in keeping, though even that must be modified again by that of *number*. There is a great study here even in these respects.

But the prefix is the main point, is in fact *the* pronoun for the *ideus*. In the one it is ἑ, *q. d. fε*, as we see it in the *dual* number σφεις, &c.; εἰς is its *singular*. To these belong ἑταιρος, ἑτερος, ἑτοῖμος, and they have a corresponding *dualizing* kind of force. There must be a correspondent to which belong ἑτης, ἑτεός, ἔτος, ἔτυμος, and so on. The true force of the formula ἑ-τ seems correctly represented by our Latin (?) word *iterate, iteration;* as even that may be distinguished from

iter, or *repetition*. Consider that the Hebrew has but two *genders*, though three numbers; and that we have three *genders*, and only two *numbers*. That as the Hebrew *second* gender includes all that is not in the *first*; so our *plural*, or second number, while it *expresses* only *more* than the singular, actually includes *most*.

Now whatever the positive sing. masc. *q. d.* of ἑ-τερος = *fε-τερος* may be, this itself means an *iterate* thereof, not there *from*, perhaps. Whereas ἐχ-θρος, ἔ-χθ-ρος, while it is also an *iterate*, the transfer of the aspirate from ρ to τ, making the latter θ, suggests an iterate *from*, rather than thereof, perhaps. The positive sing. masc. thereof then will be ἔχτ.; and what is this but literally the Hebrew חטא reversed,—*perverted, confounded?* The Hebrew *ordo* = *a, b, c;* the Greek *c, a, b*, or in English very sounds *cta*, becomes *act*, and its *iterate* would be *fact*. Is this really a *puerile play* or '*accident*,' only? or is it not probably much more significant?

This being allowed, or even something like it, we unhesitatingly pronounce the ἀ of ἀ-μαρτια, to be the *iterate* of ἀ; the parallel at least of ἐ-γω, *a*ham, I, as distinguished from *me, my*, &c. This exactly corresponds too with the *terms* employed, as well as the metaphors or imagery, in Rom. vii. 14—23.

And now compare Eph. ii. 15–16, and Coloss. ii. 11–15, with this argument. The actual "*alteration thorough*," or 'reconciliation,' belongs then *to us*, not to God; for all is reversed "*in us*," where the *iterate, fα*, is "Primate, ἀρχων, *of the power of the air*," "I having been self-sold under it," and usurps the seat of ἀ, or *I*; so that ὢν ἐχθρος, "forasmuch as being *I out of myself* (comp. Luke xv. 17) or *hostile*," I am *pitiable, quitiable*, 'non-descript.' "Nevertheless I do live, not still I, but in me there lives Christ: and *what*, or *that which* (*I*) live (I) live (*lives*) by the belief of God's having loved me and bye-given Himself over me (*mine?*)."

The idea of even *iteration* is too strong to express the force of this conjoined παρα—, ὑπερ. We do not at all admit that God-*Father* is *iterated* in the Son, and *re-iterated* in the Holy Ghost; still less that there is *alteration*, ἀλλος, ἀλλαγη. "*Letter* or *Gramma* may kill us," because we cannot understand 'Three Persons One God,' "but the Spirit giveth life." We use these terms and figures because *Scriptural*, not because we 'understand' them.

Whereas *iteration* is too weak a term for Paul in respect *of us*; or rather, he does not dwell on the ἑτερ- as such, but calls it "*death*," and us "*dead*," νεκροὶ; and there 's a kind of *end*. Yet, says he, "nevertheless *we* live, not still WE indeed, but there is in *us* Christ." But we are "*thoroughly altered*"; it is not that we have only *lost*, so as to "*come to* our-selves," like the prodigal, for that we did when *we* "*died away*"; for "we live,"—"thoroughly *altered*" indeed. The alteration, *iteration* which we underwent about the "baptism into death," he describes to Titus, indeed, as a very "*re-genesis-ing*"; and he describes it by a word of exactly analogous form with those we above considered, λ-ουτρον, *q. d.* λ-ουτερον, E. V. "*washing*," or *a bath*, because we are actually naturally *living*. But he does not dwell on this, except implicitly, in his Epistles, except here to Titus the Gentile. What he would on this point *drive* us to is what he so affectingly urges at Coloss. iii. 1–4. "IF then —— for ye died away," *if all was genuine*. Thus it is not that he *jumps over* "the valley of the shadow of death," but the "*thorough alteration*" which he writes about is addressed to those who do "day by day" experience it, having *known*, *felt*, *told*, εἰδεναι, yet, without "coming to *factual* crisis," have yet *known*, γνοντες, or *having known*, *mind-wise*, the *actual* "crisis." So far from his *jumping over* it, he not only calls those on the nether side, but even those *in* that state, "*dead*," νεκρους; he even says that those on the *other*, or *upper*, side are "*dead*" in a certain sense,

though he still can speak of them as οἱ ζωντες, "*the living*," also in a certain sense, as he does of *his-self*, as distinguished from *him-self*. Indeed he says plainly out to the 1 Corinthians vi. 19, "we are not *ourselves*," any more than we were before when "self-sold"; "for *now* we are bought at a price," *in respect of* "our bodies [*and souls or lives, which are?* His]." And this is the "thorough-alteration" *professed*, or "*afore-said*," which he would have "*con-fessed*," or '*homologued*,' accordingly.

Nevertheless, in that phrase to Titus about παλιγγενεσία, or *again, genesis-ing*, he actually expresses the reciprocal of *iteration* by the very word *again*, prefixed to this *genesis-ing*; and the reciproque of that, is *repetition* as respects *us*. But whereas John spoke of a "Bath or Baptisma of '*Wonder*,' Paul virtually says that it cannot be short of "Baptisma *into death*" to be of any availability for "God with us." And Peter compared "the *drowning* of the old world;" and Paul again virtually says "the first tabernacle has stasis," till this is effected; till, that is, we be "dead by the trespassments, or bye-faults, and the 'sins'" which we duly homologize,' or "confess." *Then, in that state*, as John says there is ἀφεσις, or discharge, of 'sins'; that is, as we have seen, of "*enmities*," and "*aversion*," Eph. ii. 3, and "*displeasure*," or *unfaith*, ἀπειθεία. *Then* we discover a λουτρον *of genesising again.*

But this implies λυτρον, and ἀπολυτρωσις; and this again bespeaks ἱλασμος — "a wealth, or rather a Wealthful of Mercy," Eph. ii. 4, "overwhelming our fulness of the *pitiable* and lamentable"; "*hostility*" cannot but disappear one would suppose, whether *its fellows*, that is our "*sins*," do "*absent*" themselves or no. That, however, is just the query!

But *first:* The word '*again-genesis-ing*,' suggests a '*trying again.*' It is much to be observed that the great word

ἁ-μαρτία, is *fem.*, which in Hebrew includes the *neuter*; that, because fem. or neut., its being μαρτ-, or *Martial*, as *our* "fellow," only makes *it* the more non-natural, un-natural and offensive to real Humanity. *This* is "adultery" with a vengeance. This is indeed a very proximate and *close* view of the case to us. It behoves us to see what this approximative idea means, from the use of the phrase παραπλησιως μετεσχε at Heb. ii. 14, — most difficult to put in English! We may attempt it by a parody of St. John's expression, that *though it is in us we are not of it*; as he says of certain renegades, or 'runagates,' "they went out from us, but they were not of us." But the answer to this 'query' is the work of a life.

Second. How is "again" possible, unless its *prior* be exhausted? We miss the marrow of the matter when we urge 'creation out of nothing.' "Creation" is not an overcoming of mere *inertia*, or inert materials, only; it is an *ex-cretion* of, at least the vehicles of, neophytes. It is, in fact, a colonizing of youngsters.

Thirdly. But here we have, before this "beginning-again" is possible, an overcoming of reluctance, attachments, endearments, and what not in the shape of associates. Ireland, beautiful Ireland, is a very picture of this now. Before we dream of the "*wisdom*" of 'emigration' we must be reduced to a very low ebb. It is painful to enquire, *Why? What by?* Is it *painful?* Then there is 'hope'! When?

Fourthly; ἱλασμός, "a Wealthful of ἱλας," = ἱλασμος, call it "Pity," "Mercy," what you will — it is the analogue of "hope"; — or, must we say, of "faith"? Here is a 'tight fit' to be '*exact*'; it is not pretended to be '*easy*,' it is to 'work easy' by working. Paul says it is "out of belief into belief"; St. John takes an advanced view, or a view from an advanced stage, when he speaks of "grace ἀντι

grace's belongings." St. James says it is '*works*.' But St. Paul wants to establish *the working* '*gear*' and its *nidus*, and its *nisus*. He says with great emphasis at 1 Cor. iv. 9, "For I opine," that is, I am of opinion, I think, that as the God gave Jesus as an exemplar to us, so "the God, us the Apostles last, ab-dicated [*exhibited forth*] as ἐπιθανατίους —— as off-scourments of the world [*Cosmos*], of all a very scum." ἐπιθανατίους, "*death-wise* '*tip-toppers*,' or '*cappers*.'" Agreeable to this is Colos. i. 24, so often objected to if literally taken; that "*I fill up again on the other hand* the fag-ends, or fag-end-ments, of the suffered-ments of the Christ in my body over His body, which the 'Church' is." It is in fact a truth of 'revelation,' a *fact of discovery*, that any one of us can possibly be "*called out*" to be a member of "His body; which the "*out-called-y*" is" — 'the Church.' It is hard to recognize that the 'excommunicates' and 'outcasts' can possibly be, or become, "the *Called-out-y*" or 'Church'; that 'ex-ceptions *can* ever *prove* the rule'!

And yet here is the wonderful exception! An "Angel" sure enough, for He is "the Messenger of the *Covenant*," or '*tween-posit*; like the "Lamp" that waded backwards and forwards *between the halves* of Abram's birds, so as to copulate them into a Formal Oath. "A Wealthful of *Mercy*," ἱλασμος; and yet, from our first impression, it is but a Wealthful of *Pity!* But even that is a Wonder, rightly viewed. Who is God? Who is 'the sinner'? Any Harmony which subsists must be that of contrast.

Accordingly says Paul, interrupting himself to say it — Eph. ii. 5, "by grace ye are *in being at all*, having been saved." Again, ver. 8, having illustrated "the overthrown Wealth of His grace,," he adds, "for by the grace ye are *in being at all*, having been saved by belief; and this *being saved, is* not out of you, it is of God the dower; not out of works, so that scarcely any one should be boasting himself," *or* '*bragging*.'

But ἱλασμος, "Wealthful of Mercy," being "of the God," leads to Action for its object. And that Action, circumstances, conditions, objects, aims, being what they are with *us* the hoped for and intended Beneficiaries, involved Passion "from the beginning." It was prefigured to us πολυμερως και πυλυτροπως from the beginning of present Humanity, and from the beginning of every "son of man" since. The parent Man has not eyes nor *Will* to see the Figure; the privileged man, wonderful to say, has less; nevertheless, there stands "The Sinner's Friend"! "Come unto Me," says He; for, if "*in all things* He became πρωτευων, or Firsting," He was there, in that "Baptism into death" before me.

Satisfactory as this must be to Mind, Reason, Thought, 'exactly,' too, as this meets the case, will not the case meet It? *Will* it not "Come"? Has *Heart* nothing to say to turn the scale of "hostility" or 'sin'? To this is Paul's final resort when he comes to Nature; having, like John the Baptist just before The Crisis, repudiated all peculiar and privilege beyond the fact that "*we are*" *in being;* so does Paul "thank God he baptized scarcely anybody." Never mind, *why not?* This has nothing valid to do with the fact; he repudiates all 'humbug,' and *is anything to anybody,* "if by any means he may WIN some" to Truth. For, when he rests all upon πίστις, "*belief,*" he resorts to what we *can* '*tell*'; nothing *above* nor *below* the reach of *mind* nor *imagination,* but εἰδησις in some form; that is, *what we can* '*tell*' in some way, as easily as we can our right hand from our left, and, says St. John, right from wrong. "For," says Paul, "by the *heart* Man believes into exactiness.

Moreover, observe, that whereas most speak as if 'confession' or "homology of sins" preceded, or at least accompanied, John's Baptism, Luke does not say so. Thus does Paul here, as well as in Rom. x. 10, so quote *Moses,* as to say

that *first*, "by the heart man believes into exactness," and *then* 'confession,' or homology, is made by the mouth into "safety," or rather "*safetery*." So that here St. Paul actually antedates the '*death*,' much more the "again-genesis-ing." So, virtually, Heb. xi. 6.

And now not only every Apostle, but every Christian, will have his own most force-ful Figure to express his experience by. That which very many most naturally and even fiducially, or at least hopefully, jump at is "the wedding garment" picture, which St. John records our Lord as having drawn. But this is getting a long way ahead of and too fast for the Apostle of the Gentiles, Paul. This may be all *en regle* for the privileged; but this is not Paul's course.

St. Paul even talks about ἐπιθανατίους for "*the Apostles*"; something which even 'caps' death! And see the adjunct even to this at Col. i. 24. Nevertheless, he does use the *correspondent to* "the wedding garment"; but like to "the coats of skins" given by the Lord God to our first Parents just before their expulsion from Eden; given *q. d.* as if before our Exodus out of even Egypt we need *protection*, especially if having voluntarily discarded our fig-leaves. Now this correspondent is the 'pre-position, ὑπερ; which St. Paul employs ten to one more than all the other Writers put together.

It is impossible to do otherwise than suspect that even with "Cephas, James, and John," and so of course with 'Early Church,' their fig-leaves stuck to them in spite of their better sense. Now what fig-leaves *mean* except to cover "shame," and so beget a kind of 'mock modesty,' it is hardly for us to say. But every man is *doubtful* of another man when this other man adopts them; he thinks them but *crutches*.

St. Paul, on the other hand, having *pinned* every thing

to *Belief, to begin with, ὑπαρχων;* that is, having "laid the foundation" in the *belief* which inducted us *into* "*death,*" and yet survives; into *belief* which is the *telling* faculty, "common *belief;*" Titus i. 4; he thus really leaves "no room for apologetic excuses" upon defection; hardly for "*shrinking*" or "drawing back to perdition," abolition, or dis-integration. It is this thought which emboldens those two serious passages at Heb. vi. 4; x. 26. So 2 Peter ii. 20. For, as we said about *wonder*, so about "*Belief*" it is well said, we cannot efficiently consider it in the abstract. We cannot *feel*, nor *tell*, nor *wonder*, nor *believe* without subject or object. However *abstract* πίστις, *belief*, may be as in anywise connected with οἶδα, or εἴδησις, sense or feeling or '*tell*'-ing, yet our only way to reach it is as *I believe, I* "*faith.*" It is indeed, in the abstract, that *principle* which induces a devotee to kiss his Idol, or to the pure kiss of parent and his child, or to the intimate kiss of man and wife; but all these fall short of that intense osculation or adoration of a humble man and his God. Our Lord puts it as "eating His flesh and drinking His blood"; and this as even the *necessary* to our "*life*" [ζωη]. This again, "*life*" is a great advance from simple "*being,*" and even from "moving"; as if from γεν-, to γενν-. St. Paul *begins* with "belief," something we *can* '*tell*'; and *from thence* he relies on the exuberance of genuine Nature, but especially on the *gushings* of Humanity at the ordeal then Divinely pourtrayed as Real.

No doubt a great deal of what occurs is extra-ordinary, preter-natural, super-natural, if you please; but where will you fix the definings of Nature, except in the definitions and differences of *the Objects* it embraces? or would embrace? About whom are the 'beatitudes' at Matt. v. addressed to the disciples but the "*far advanced*" in the most *natural* features of largest and commonest occurrence? — "To the disciples," mind, *among* "*the multitudes*" which induced Jesus

to "sit down, open his mouth, and teach." And *how* "far advanced"? From what? To what? In what? What mute, silent, but earnest *gushings* of "the poor," "the mourning," "the meek," &c., does He name! Are these *very* ultra-natural? God knows better than we do.

I will not here yet meddle with this great *Ideus*, ἱλασμος, but pursue the lower line of physiological thought.

Fifthly, then. See our Lord's great proposition to Nicodemus, John iii. "Nicodemus came by night towards Him and said [εἶπεν] to Him, 'Rabbi, we wist [*i. e., we 'can tell'*] Item, from God Thou self-camest a Teacher; no one is capable to do [*make, &c.*] the these 'signs' which THOU doest [*makest, &c.*] unless there be the God amidst him.'" Mark here the force of "*we can tell — Item.*" — "The Jesus was replied, 'Verily, verily, I lege [λεγω] to thee unless any one were born [γεννη-] from upwards, he is not capable to wit [ἰδεῖν] the reign ["kingdom"] of the God." Here ἰδεῖν refers to οἴδαμεν above, say = '*wit*' and '*wist.*' The word *reign* for *realm* or "*kingdom*," as synonymous of βασιλεία, is often so in Josephus; it means here, however, as also generally in N. T., neither *time* (*reign*) nor *place* (realm), but kingly-*rule*. And this especially has reference to μετὰ, "*amidst* him."

Nicodemus evidently does not understand the proposition, as *we* usually have interpreted his answer. His difficulty lies not in ἀνωθεν, "*from upwards*," to which he makes no allusion; for in all nations '*heaven*' — the locale of God, has been deemed "*upwards*." But it lies in γεννη-; and so does our usual understanding of his answer.

"Leges [λεγει] towards Him does the Nicodemus, How is a man, an old man being, capable to have been born [γεννη-]? Scarcely is he capable into the womb of his mother a second *time* (?) to have entered and been born [γεννη-]."

Now our common idea of this answer requires some con-

junctive, such as 'and *then* been born,' or 'and been born *afterwards*,' or the like; but there is none such. I have little doubt that although "*born*" be suitable enough in popular language for γεννᾰ-, it is not accurate physiologically; but that strictly it refers to '*breeding*,' as distinguished from '*breed*.' The word γερων, if at all akin to *gerens*, supports this view; implying that being already *gerent*, that is '*gravid*,' he *is a* '*fixture*,' whatever process of *inversion* he may undergo. The strict reference is to the incubation of the embryo, which said embryo is compounded of *ovum*, the vehicular copula, and the γεν-, or *breed*, or *vis*, "from upwards." It is exactly thus at Gen. i. 11: "And God said, 'Let the earth bring forth,——and the earth brought forth,"—— is qualified by ii. 5,—"the LORD God made—every plant of the field *before it was in the earth*, and every herb of the field *before it grew*." And it is exactly thus that the seeming surprise of Jesus at "the Teacher of the Israel," and his want of observation and reflection, takes the form of His reply at ver. 12; "If the τὰ ἐπίγεια, the *things* which '*cap on*,' or '*top*,' earthy *affairs* I proposed [εἶπον] to you *all*, ye do not even believe, how though [ἐὰν] I proposed to you *all* the *things* which 'cap-on' or 'top,' heaven-y *affairs* will ye believe"?

Now this evidently implies that not only is γεννᾰ, or *breeding*, an "*earthy*" affair, but that γεν-, or *breed*, that which '*caps*,' or '*puts the top on*,' upon γεννᾰ-, is also an "*earthy*" affair. This is the force of ἐπι always in St. Paul's strict language, as we before remarked on ἐπιθυμία, ἐπιγνωσις, &c. Compare Gen. i. 27 in the Hebrew, as well as E. V. But all this too implies, by ἐπὶ, that γαῖα, or γεῖα, is the subnormal state of Nature now, and that ἐπὶ makes it normal.

There is not a proper *vis-a-vis* for ἐπὶ, unless ἀπὸ be such, analogous to κατα for ἀνα, and ὑπερ for ὑπὸ. It is as if the

absence of ἐπὶ for γαια is enough to describe the Natural Estate *now;* and that ἀπὸ would refer to *the loss from* an *earlier normal* nature.

It is thus that, as is his wont, St. Paul founds a maxim which he thus propounds, ἡ κατ' ἐκλογην προθεσις, "*the according-to-ecloge proposition,*" in which, "*ecloge*" is procuring *cause,* "proposition," or preposition, the *effect, q.d.* or *object,* and NOT *vice-versa.* It is thus that *breeding* can 'procure' *breed;* or, in Scripture terms, that "the seed of the *woman* shall bruise the serpent's [or martial] head." It is thus that γενν- can modify γεν-. And I doubt not that some corresponding idea made St. Peter write (2 Pet. i. 20) respecting the Hebrew *graphs,* "Every graph of its own private, or *peculiar,* or *particular,* loosening forth (as from a leash), does not come to be," or *to happen.* There is no ignoring of "*purpose*" or "*preposition,*" but a *wrapping up of it* so as to be discovered and '*proposed*' by the λογ-, or *out-come,* "ecloge," which vehicled it as its couplet, *q. d.,* and thus gave it proposal or prominence.

But while St. Paul thus makes use of these actual natural phenomena, which he does by the words φυσει, ἐνεφυσεν (the LXX. word), ἐμφυτὸς, and the like; and even goes so far as to describe himself to the Galatians as being "*panged,*" as if by very 'orgasm,' "while, or until Christ be formed in them"; yet his great instrument is the "preposition' ὑπὲρ, especially with the 'genitive,' for all the ἐπουρανία *affairs.*

It is worth suggesting, however, in this last use of ἐπὶ with οὐρανια, that from man's stand point, *heaven* being above him, what is *upon* the heaven is also *above* the man, and *then* ἐπὶ means '*up*-on'; whereas, with respect to "*earthy,*" it means '*down*-on' *from* the man '*upon*' the things.

Now that great preposition ὑπὲρ I believe to be all but

synonymous with the Hebrew metaphor, כפר, as antitype to type. All "creation," especially *sex*, is *typical* of some superior "Pattern shewn in the Mount" *to some*, (?) to be *copied* by them as inferior, προσκαιρα, '*with reference to occasions*'; then, further, posteriorly to become real *copies*, or "*types*," of an anterior Proto-Type. The real *nucleus* of the *Ritual* was *signified* in the Mosaic Ark, the ἱλαστηριον of which St. Paul quotes at Rom. iii. 25; but the kernel of that *nucleus* was the ἱλασμος of which St. John writes, 1 John ii. 2, and St. Paul in a still profounder term as αἰτιος, Heb. v. 9, to which αἰτία corresponds.

Sixthly, then, let us see the further reply of Jesus to Nicodemus's answer. "Jesus was replied," ver. 5, "Verily, verily, I lege [λεγω] to THEE, unless any one were born [γενν-*bred?*] out of water [ὑδατος] and spirit [*Cod. Sin. unless any one out of water and spirit were born*], he is not capable to wit [εἰδεῖν, *to idea?*] the realm of the heavens [*Cod. Sin.*]. The *thing* having been born [γενν-*bred*] out of the flesh, flesh it is; and the *thing* having been born [*bred*] out of the spirit, spirit it is. Scarcely mayest thou marvel, *Item*, I proposed [εἶπον] to thee, 'It is necessary [δεῖ] that ye have been born [*bred*] from upwards.' The Spirit whither it wills it 'spires; and the voice of it thou hearest [*hearest of*], but wistest not ["*canst not tell*," E. V.] whence it comes and where it leads down *to* ['*settles*'?]; thus is every he having been born [*bred*] out of the water [*Cod. Sin.*] and the spirit," *q. d. before-named.* "Nicodemus was replied and proposed [εἶπεν] to Him, How is it possible that these *things* (or, *How are these* things *capable*) to be genesis'd (γεν-)?"

It is not desirable to mangle this great passage by dissecting it, when study is all that it needs. Because, as an argument, it so evidently is based upon, and runs on, '*the nature* of Things.'

But we must notice that "out of water and spirit," after-

wards, "out of the water and the spirit" (by *Cod. Sinait.*), is the parallel to ἀνωθεν, "*from upwards.*" The difference between the Greek *texts* looks as if the phrase was an ordinary formula; and that water implies spirit also, and spirit water. Possibly the 'articles' in the latter phrase are but references to the former phrase. But whether so or not, would any one contend from this that "*water*-baptism" is meant as an indispensable hereby? Although St. Paul "thanks God he baptized no one," save a certain few he names, "lest any one should say [*propose*] into the mine own name I baptized. For not apostle me did Christ to baptize, but to be evangelizing." At any rate, supposing that "baptism in water" were so contended for, does it not seem probable that such an opposition of it with "evangelizing," or *well-angelling*, as this exhibits, limits the suitableness of the former to those who require "signs and wonders," who, as Jesus says, are therefore "an evil and adulterous generation"?

Looking at natural parturition from the female in the natural world, I see it as typified in the 'spiritual' parturition. As in the case of Adam too, "eating bread in the sweat (*water*) of his brow," by "tilling the ground from whence he was taken." But preliminary to that, the preliminary, or "from upwards," *deliquium animi* in ecstacy, which is the condition of both parents in healthy animal nature, is typical too of that 'spiritual' death which, as we have learned, precedes the former phenomenon—or rather, act- and fact- *arrested* as that is—"they not coming into crisis." It is "over such," so experienced, *so developed*, that "the second death has not ἐξουσία, *existence*," but *q. d.* over their bodies only. Of course, however, when we come to speak of "death," in any form, or under any name, we are on the very confines of what we mean by the *natural*. As we have seen, we "died away, and are not our-selves"; the *selfs* have

disappeared, or are oscillating *q. d.* with sin, as Rom. vii. 9. For, as St. John writes, years after, *of all*, "if we say we have not 'sin' we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in *us*. Though [ἐὰν] we homologue our sins," he adds, "*believed*-able and *righti-ous* [*exact*]. He is, so that he may cancel ("*remit*," *discharge, absent*) our 'sins,' and purge us from all ἀδικία, *injustice, injury*," &c.

Seventhly. This accords with the 'Baptism of Wonder' which John heralded; but though the "homology of sins," which two of the Evangelists say he virtually demanded or exacted, was preparatory to *a death* by the virtual "*drowning*" which he typically practised; the "absence or 'remission,' discharge, of sins," which he made *promissory at the end* thereof, was the occupation of *a life* then and there *to be begun*. It is thus we must understand St. Paul's figure to Titus, "the washing or Bath of again-genesis-ing," *q. d.* "out of water," as Peter, 2 Pet. iii. 5, "and *then* the renewal of Holy Spirit which he poured out upon us richly." But this must be further examined.

Only twice does this word λουτρόν occur, and both times in Paul, Eph. v. 26, besides this place. The *verb*, λούειν, once only by St. Paul (or rather, Luke) at Acts xvi. 33, unless Heb. x. 22 be another instance. And this really looks as though he *purposely avoided* the words "*baptize*" and "*baptism*" in this deep and high relation which "baptism" pretended to already, as being of Mosaic, and *therefore* Divinely, ritual meaning once; but now expired therefore.

Eighthly, then, — beginning with that passage of Epistle to Titus, we afterwards go on to Acts ii. In this Epistle we seem to have a *condensation* of Thought and Feeling into Language, as in those to Timothy before. John had said that "He coming after him," "Who was his First" notwithstanding, "whose shoe latchet he was not worthy to unloose, He shall baptize us in Holy Spirit and Fire," &c.,

Luke iii. 16. He adds, ver. 18, "Many things indeed then and other, advising, he (John) evangelized (or *gospelled*) the people"; so that *this* John not only "*preached*," as E. V. has it, but "preached *the Gospel*," as the word is always elsewhere rendered.

But "*the* Law" did not other than "*cover*," כפר, ὑπὲρ, *over*, the sinner, who "*homologues* his sins"; and in that "way" "discharge, remission, or absence, of the 'sins'" is procured to the culprit. But even that suggests, that to be "exact to conscience or consentience," a Person is required such as is here styled Lord, κυριος; like κυρ-ος, and כורש ועי, "*Cyrus* My Shepherd" of Isa. xliv. 28, the Type of "the Good Shepherd"; as if כור were the true or relative correspondent to כפר. He thus becomes a "*Saviour*"; and a "Saviour" of *us* too; who also are "awaiting, ἀπεκδεχομενοι, the ransoming away of our *saved-ment, i. e.*, body, even υἱοθεσια; *son-position by appointment*, [θεσ-]," as if it were "a fragment that remains and must not be lost, but gathered up." No less than three times in three verses does this affecting Title of "Saviour" occur; ii. 10–13; and again in our passage.

12. — "So that —— we may live in the now Æon, looking for [E. V. rather *betaking ourselves to*?] the far-advanced hope and epiphany of the glory [*opination, gloire*] of the great God and Saviour of us, Jesus 'Christ,' He who gave Himself over [ὑπερ] us so that He may be ransoming us."

iii. 3. — "For we were awhile [ποτε], we also, thoughtless, [? ἀνόη-τοι], &c. Then too [ὁτε δε] the usability [*availability*] and the philanthropy appeared [ἐπ-] of our Saviour, God. 5, not out of works those which in rightiness [*justiness, exactiness*] did we, but, according to that of Him *which is* mercy, He saved us."

It is perfectly plain that in both these passages "*Saviour of us*" or "*our Saviour*" is an exposition of the word

"*Lord*," κυρ-ι-ος. Of this latter word the ι- is the Hebrew "*Jah*," as יְ, the essential of יהוה, or in Greek, *ι-ος*. This final ς is that which personifies the *name* as does the שׁ in כורשׁ, κυρ-ος, "*Cyrus*," from אישׁ, ἀνηρ.

Now without exactly knowing *what* "sin" is, or *why* it is in the world, yet all nations of the world have tacitly or implicitly homologued the truncated or defective state of Human Nature or Humanity, so as *instinctively* to beget in them the sublime *Ideus* of a God; and they have virtually regarded Him as not only Benefactor, or, on the contrary, Vindicator, but as a *Goel* and so somehow "Saviour." Often no doubt highly perverted and distorted by most, by none more than the Jews themselves even after the Exodus; nevertheless the fundamental *Instinct* was more or less *a* '*Constant*.' How a Goel or a Vindicator for *ex*treme violence or violation can be or procure satisfaction, (for instance,) for his death, to the dead *being dead*, is not easy for man to divine; and accordingly it is sublimely written Εμοι ἐκδικησις; "To ME, For ME, With ME is Vindication or Righting out." But that Man should have the bare idea of 'Apology' *in any form*, by way of reparation, compensation, 'sacrifice,' argues not only perpetuation of "belief" as of a *natural* life and 'conscience' or consentience, but "sorrow," disappointment, without which no such Idea could have been conveyed to, nor arisen in, the mind. And if this have been tortured and exasperated into Vindictiveness either by superciliousness of the Elevated, or by their insolence towards those who held that Instinct, *is that wonderful?* No "*lording* it over *God's* Heritage" can under any circumstances *now*, be right; nor safe, nor expedient, with living Jews *distinct* among the 'nations as protests' against even Divine Favouritism even in favoured men! But how from the earliest history do we learn that it has been practised!

These remarks seem to have a direct connexion with one

of the only two passages in which the word λουτρον occurs; and yet it will be thought probably by some very far-fetched; which indeed to others may be a recommendation. It occurs here, and at Eph. v. 26.

Of course every one will refer to Bishop Ellicott's beautiful Editions. But I submit that the notes he will find there are awanting of *full point*. The close of his note on ἐν ῥήματι (from my stand-point), if not ambiguous, is at least undecisive; inasmuch as it assumes, by the word 'baptismal,' *as well known*, what I contend is *unknown*, as to its true value.

The very word is peculiar. I above hinted at its similarity to ἕτερος, in so far as it is a variation in gender, number, or degree from some *unfixed positive*. If such a paradox will be allowed, the word is a contraction of λοετρόν: see L. and S. comparisons on λούω, which means 'especially to *wash the body*; νίπτω the *hands and feet*; πλυνώ *clothes*.' Compare John xiii. 10.

How comes λ-ούω to be thus written, as if *lavo* were full equivalent, when it is a contraction of λ-οέω? If so, in other cases it would be λ-ῳῶ. Thus is a clue afforded to me by comparing οὗτος and αὐτός and ἕτερος; but I do not at once see its drift, as the last agrees too with λουτρον, so far as above suggested.

Be it accepted, however, that λουτρον = *lavatrum*, *q. d.* '*laver*,' as being a current word. But being so, I cannot but associate Gen. i. 6–11 and 2 Pet. iii. 5, 7 with the idea, if we are to associate that of "baptism" with it. And then we must not forget that the *secondly*-ordered status of ver. 5 (of Peter) is spoken of as the *means* of the "cataclysm" of ver. 6, and that the *recovery* of the first status, analogically, in the person of Noah and the seven persons, has its "*antitype* in baptism," 1 Pet. iii. 21.

But in this passage of Titus we are *not* speaking of

"baptism" *by name* at least, which is all 'the law' business, and the occasion for it supposed to be *defunct;* and if *antitypical* at all it is to the *primal* state described in Genesis, as above referred to, and which Peter *separately* refers to in his second Epistle in connexion with *destruction*, not *recuperation*. And this *destructive* process is I believe what the Apostle Paul would refer to *per se* for *baptism* as the very *necessary* chaotic, — not to say *wonder*-ful, though in the sphere and matter of mind I claim it,—condition, or state of disintegration, ἀπωλεια, necessary for παλιγγεσια, or 'again-genesis-ing' *thoroughly*.

So if we trace our word "*wash*" through the German *wasser*, water, and the verb *waschen*, to wash, Hilpert well says, it is 'allied to the French *gouachè*, *i. e.* painting in water-colours or 'distemper'; *gâcher*, to mix mortar, to temper, to rinse linen, to bungle, to make a mess of; *gâchis*, plash, slop, puddle.' Compare Ezekiel's "*dauḇ* with untempered mortar." The word clearly connects us with בעת in Isaiah, early referred to, which means the *smash, crash, horror* of breaking up; and we may add *splash* of water. The *touch*, with the tip of the blooded Priest's finger in the victim-blood, upon the altar under "*the* law," as the *splash* on the door-posts at the Exodus; all *trifles* to the beneficiaries, but "death" to the victim.

I will not further meddle with Bishop Ellicott's note in Ephesians, beyond the suggesting that ἐν ῥηματι there means "in *fact*," as respects "the Church," *passive;* "in *act*" [or "word"] as respects "the Christ," *active*. And this connects this *articled* passage with the other passage in Titus, which is anarthrous.

For, if I mistake not the very pivot of the Gospel to man's eye, there is the same convergence of act and fact, as we saw above in that passage of Epistle to Titus. But a higher λουτρον than this is named everywhere; *e. g.* Phil.

ii. 6, 8; Gal. iv. 4; Prov. viii. 22, and Isaiah, and Genesis, &c., &c., &c.. Angels wondered; devils are horrified; for they believe that what He has is "by inheritance," because "He is, was, and will be."

It might be to this second λουτρον of "our Saviour God," of which "the agony in the Garden" was the acme, but had its *shadow* to Him in the *betrayal* of the manhood by man; which at the same time was *substance* to the manhood of *the Man-God* and the commencement of the '*break up*' preparatory to "again-genesis-ing" as of *the God-man*,—it might be with reference to this then forth-coming λουτρον that Jesus said, "I have a baptism to be baptized," Luke xii. 50; and yet He had been "baptized in water" by John so that "they might becomingly fulfil all exacti-ness," as if it had been rather for *John's* sake than His own or the Law's. So that this was a then future Baptism which he referred to; of no mere "water," but "of *sweat*, as it were great drops of blood falling to the ground"; so copious were they! What *mimickry* is 'holy water'! The "crown of thorns and the purple robe" were hardly more so, and may become infinitely less so to the Priest as well as to his superstitious devotee!

And now, finally, study poor Peter, at 1 Pet. ii. 18–25, a passage which, after ver. 17 (!) he addresses to all who are οἰκέται, *domestics;* remembering that if "He suffered OVER us, to us leaving down a full *hypogram* so that we may follow up by His foot-steps," it is implied that we must become *copies* of suffering UNDER Him. This inference is inevitable by St. Paul's deliberate "judgment," 2 Cor. v. So that not "baptism in water," nor only "baptism of *wonder*," but a *baptism of "sweat*," a '*break up*' of the constitution, alone avails for even the possible of "*again-genesising*." In this condition it is that a "remission," "absolution," but which the Greek calls ἄφεσις, "*absence*, or *absentence*, of sins" which *are parts and parcels of us*, can

alone occur *to us;* nor until then have we any proper conception of the real nature of "*sin,*" or *wrong;* our own very nature being wrongfully depressed, and all but entirely reversed to begin with, in 'the better half' of it. What it can effect even in us is best learned by what it provoked man to do to Jesus in Judæa; to man's eye it lies in this passage of Ep. to Titus, which I connect directly with "our Saviour God" as the *patient,* while in Eph. for "the Church," "The Christ" is the *agent.* It is difficult to read the passage quite parenthetically, because the two radii coming to one focus coalesce there. Yet a parenthesis *is* begun.

At ii. 11, that the *feeling* for "ornamentation (κοσμῶσιν) of our Saviour God may be in all; for the grace of the God appeared (ἐπ'-*dawned?* or the opposite, *blazed*) which is salvatory to — or for — all men," &c. And now comes iii. 4; omit what may be regarded as parenthetic, or rather, take the parenthesis first. 'He is verily our Saviour,' — "not of our works, those in rightiness, exactiness, which we did, *even* WE, but according to that of Him which is mercy He saved US," of course, in the same "*way*" as "He saved himself," by *a mean,* being μεσιτης, or, '*Go amidst.*' Now read without the parenthesis, and, as the text is, *anarthrous.*

"Then too [*i. e.* in the direful condition of ver. 3] the usability, or *availability, negotiability,* and the philanthropy blazed forth [*? dawned ?*] of our Saviour God — by a *lavatrum* ['*wash*'] of an again-genesis-ing, and re-novation of Holy Spirit [Rom. i. 3, 4] which *(spirit)* He poured out upon us richly through *(by)* Jesus Christ our Saviour"; *i. e.* "by Jesus Christ's" *being,* or *becoming,* "our *Saviour*" *in very probability;* for this is the force and value of the verbal in τὸς, χριςος. It is this last clause which supplies what is claimed for the former, and it destroys the concinnity of the passage to repeat the very same thing with the very same bearings. Grant, gladly, that it is a new truth converging

from the opposite direction upon the same *focus* "us"; which new truth is, that as our Saviour is God, and Jesus Christ is our Saviour, therefore Jesus Christ is God; but do not mar the telling parenthetic truth *within* the focus, *within* "*us*" that is, viz., that "He saved us according to His τὸ, *which is* mercy."

But how can "again-genesis-ing" be said of the Christ? Quite well. It is the very pillar of the Gospel. Luke speaks of His genesis-ing in 'the Virgin Mary'; Paul speaks of the other repeatedly, but especially to this very point at Rom. i. 4, where he calls it ἐξ ἀναστασις, *a proof* "out of resurrection out of dead *ones*." How they were to Him λουτρον, bye-standers can see both at *natural* birth and death, and He felt too on the Cross. Where, by the bye, man, too, only that he is too much pampered by a Favouritism which, "through you" favoured ones, bewildered and unnerved the common sense of even Imperial Roman prerogative in its Lieutenant, Pontius Pilate,—man still *could see* the same.

Section 15.

The writer, St. Luke, of both the "Gospel" and "the Acts," being the same person, and these Books connected, they should be read connectedly; say from Luke xxiv. 44–53, Acts i. 1–11, then Acts ii.

Our Lord dates all from the Scripture, xxiv. 46, 47.—"Thus it is written, and thus it was necessary [*binding*] to have suffered The Christ, and to have resurrected [*up-standed*] out of (*the*) dead by the third day, and to have been heralded upon His name Wonder, ["*Repentance*"] and absentence of sins, into all the nations [Gentiles, Heathens], it [*the herald-ing*] having been begun [*gotten Principle*?] from Jerusalem. YE too are witnesses of these." Who are the "YE"? See ver. 33, "the two"—"found crowded together the eleven, *and those with them*." Connect too ver. 36.

Then, ver. 49, "And behold, I do apostle the 'promise' [? *ep-angelly*] of My Father upon YOU; YE, too, have sat ye down in the city Jerusalem until ye be endued ability out of Highest." Connect ver. 50, 51; and is it not more than probable that ALL besides "the eleven" and "the two," would accompany? Note "the *two*" "found *the eleven* and those with them." Therefore Acts i. 1–4 requires careful reading; for the term "apostles" was not yet then restricted to "the eleven." Do but collate the passages under ἀποστολος in Bruder, to see the noble wailing of Paul!

Then Acts i. 4,—"but [αλλα] to stay-about the promise (?) of the Father which [*of which?*] ye heard of, *from* Me; Item, John indeed 'baptized' *by*, or *with*, water, YE too [ὑμεῖς δὲ] shall be baptized IN Holy Spirit"——ver. 8, "But [ἀλλα] ye will have been getting ability of, or from, having upon-come the Holy Spirit upon YOU, and ye shall or will be to, for, Me witnesses"——.

Note 1; "to *stay-about*, as the obedience to παρήγγειλεν, E. V. *commanded*, cannot mean "to stay-about," περιμένειν, *Jerusalem;* because *that* is named in the previous clause.

Note 2, "the *promise*," E. V. ἐπαγγελίαν, was what they were "*to stay-about*"; and παρήγγειλεν, "He commanded [E. V.] them to stay-about" *it*.

The great subject of the '*prepositions*' I reserve for another Paper. Here we have *three* in one verse, παρά-, περὶ-, ἐπὶ-; all difficult to *fix* meanings to; but easier to infer them when, as here, they are prefixes in compounded words. There is no room to doubt the force of περὶ. Although some MSS. seem to confuse περὶ with ὑπὲρ, they are really as distinct as, for instance, a *girdle*, περὶ, from a *garment*, ὑπὲρ. The former, as well as παρὰ, apply to *planes*, or circumstances, of things on a common *level;* and so *circum* and *trans* are related synonyms respectively: But ὑπὲρ, like ὑπὸ, and ἐπὶ, even if having the same *formal* meaning, differ from the

former in having a *vertical* direction. Thus — our ἐπὶ means *upon*, whether the direction be *upward*, as we before observed on ἐπουρανιος, from our stand-point TO the sky, or *downward* FROM us ourselves to things below us.

Note 3. The word ἀγγελία, here twice used, has the 'technical' sense of "*angel*" as its foundation; to the mind of a Jew especially. Thus formed, however, it is not a *person* that is to be thought of but a *principle;* both mean that which is "*sent*"; — such as in Paul's first sermon at Lystra is instanced in "*rain* from heaven"; whence "fruitful seasons," — the "earth being αὐτοματη — *self-taught*, or *self-motived*," as St. Mark says, to respond to that "rain.

In our opening pages the ample statistical particularity of St. Luke was interpreted as indicative of an aroused constantly pervading *Influence* just then intensified by John's advent. I argue for the same, but otherwise intensified, in the word ἐπαγγελία here; as if it were an *Upon-fluence*, or *On-fluence*, ever; from the beginning until now; *filling* "Nature" and "Creation." However we describe it, whether as cause or response, it is the reciprocal to that *Nature-wise-*, φυσει, *secured* "persuasion' in all mankind, especially "heathens," or *naturals* (Rom. ii.), which is the very foundation of "Religion." Whether that originate therefore from above, or from the sub-mean, this prep. ἐπὶ is correspondently suitable, as the prefix, to its *name*.

How mysterious it is that good men should have been inventing so disparaging a phrase as '*merely* natural Religion'! It is *meant to be* disparaging too, *they* themselves being so advanced. And so they were indeed when a Bishop Jewel could leave, in his will, to his friend, — "the best horse he ever had"; and that horse was "*his walking-stick*"! Nothing, sure, but the ἀσθενεία, *imbecility*, of Humanity, the "fatuity," could have permitted arrogance and assumption

to so oust a most beautiful and wide-working Humility from its Teachers. I can even conceive the present stir in the very mud of society to be Vindictive; for He who said it, did not predict *when*, "Truth shall spring *out of the ground*"! If it prove punitive to any, it will be from their resistance to it. For, "Nature" did not *begin* 7,000, nor 9,000, years ago! I could conceive *theoretically*, that the political intent, as Origin, of England's — perhaps *any country's* — real aristocracy is the exponent of 'Natural Religion.' That it can be secured by the life-given Honour of the time of the rights of Primo-genitureship is quite another matter. For other Pharaohs regularly are raised out by descent "who knew not Joseph." The adulation and gratitude of a people which culminated on a genuine Aristocrat, stays there; the People, times and circumstances die out; but all that's *promissory* which *they thus* bequeathed in Trust to their descendants *starts from* the Hero.

The word "promise" does not *now* mean anything like this, in our ordinary use of it. We understand by it *a pledge*, and therefore a very abstraction or fiction; as, for instance, a 'pepper-corn' which grew in the Tropics, for an Estate which is situated at the Pole. But we do include what we call Honour. Yet at the utmost, it can be of itself but *promissory*, a *thing of 'promise,'* whose whole value depends on the '*Promiser*.' Whereas this *Upon-fluence* of which we speak is a very *token*, in, and of, and by, itself; in fact it is *a Principle*. And this has never been absent from creation; insomuch that St. Paul argues at Rom. viii. 20, as if "the very *prospectivity* of the creation ["creature"] is the natural response to it, which may almost be synonymous with or analogous to '*Honour*.'

Note 4, "*which ye heard of from Me*." The verb ἀκουω commands two cases. I suspect that the verb itself means to *hear of* or *hear from*, and not simply to *hear*; nor to *hearken*,

which is ἐπακουω. Let those who doubt test it. This clause does not imply that the '*On-fluence*' was not "heard of" before, but that whereas heretofore it was diffused generally and became "*common*," like everything else we benefit by, it was now brought to a Focus on "*Me*," as it had been on John, David, "Moses and the Prophets," Abraham, Noah, Adam, in succession. "Tradition," therefore, in its now technical sense, seems *de trop*; what there was *to be Traded* is already *general*. "No one *to*, or *by*, himself taketh the honour [*value, price*]; but he being "called of [*under*] the God *does*, just as really as the Aaron *did*." Compare Heb. vii. 11, Greek. But this "call" is very restrictively described at 1 Cor. i. 26–28!

Now this is "the On-fluence of the Father, which *they were* to wait about, or stay-about; which On-fluence ye heard of [Luke xxiv. 49] from Me," *in an especial manner or emphasis*. And the "*Item*" of specialty is given. Accordingly in the Gospel, the "I do apostle," and the "upon you," are both emphatical and focal; they amount to ἀκουειν ἡς, perhaps — *to hear of from which*, that is to *hear the very thing* of itself. So to speak, the thing *heard of, acuminates to actual hearing from it* upon the ear. Thus here, "I do apostle the Upon-fluence of My Father upon you." Notice too that time, place, and party all are identical in these passages of "Luke" and "Acts," so that there can be no mistake.

Note 5, "*not after many days*," E. V. is a difficult clause, yet important from its bearing on Acts ii. 1. Read with the E. V. "*but*," for δὲ, in the Gospel it *seems* explained; but, allowing that antithetic "but," it only makes Acts i. the more extraordinary. "I do apostle," cannot be postponed to these "fifty brethren," and "witnesses of" ver. 46, 47 contents; for, "having lifted up His hands He eulogued them all *in the act*, distanded from them, and was borne up into the heaven." At that very time they were *told*,

παρηγγειλεν, Acts i. "*commanded*" E. V. rather *bye-angelled*, or bye-*mitted*, *trans-mitted*, *trans-angelled*, "to stay about *the Onfluence* until when ye be endued — *clothed-in* ABILITY, ἐξ ὕψους, out of Highest"; compare i. 35, to Mary. As to the *persons*, see ἅπαντες, "*quite all*," at Acts ii. 4.

Now St. Peter at once interprets this clause as identical with that passage of Joel which speaks of "in the last days." But so too the same Peter at once interpreted the Psalm which procured the *allotting* of Matthias.

But E. V. wholly omits in this clause the pronoun, "*these* days." And whether οὐ μετὰ = "*not after*," or not rather "not *amongst*" or *amidst*, may be a question. If E. V. were *full* in its vein, it would be "not *these* many days hence." The great point of distinction is, that whereas in the *Gospel*, above quoted, the definition is by *fact*, quite irrespective of *time*, except as ἕως οὗ, "*until*," can specify it; here, in Acts i. 5, *time* is the almost striking definition, for ver. 6 is chiefly about "*time*." That it should occur "on the completion of the day of the Pentecost," or "Feast of *Tabernacles*," which word σκηνη, "*tabernacle*," reminds us of σκηνος of John i. 14, which differs (2 Cor. v. 1), was very striking to the Jew; and from this association of these texts and "the Passover," it was doubtless intended so to be. Yet that for centuries after, this said *Five-costal*, = *Fiftieth*, day should have occasioned such terrible strife about "Easter," is wonderful, except that it is suspicious. St. Paul saw the danger at its very rise, Gal. iv. 10, 11.

Well then; "sit ye down in the city [πολις] Jerusalem until" *so-and-so*, and "scarcely be departed, separated, *without-ed* from Jerusalem;" agreeing together as to indication of time and place, what of the events respectively? The Gospel is, "until ye be clad in ability out of Highest"; the "Acts," "YE too shall be baptized in Holy Spirit"; and, I should say, the *time* specified is — "*not amidst these*

many days." And certainly, if we take a *coup d' œil* of "the Book of the Acts," and collate their Epistles in tone as well as time, not only "many *days*," but also many *years*, elapsed before *these* Apostles *themselves* attained that *more than official* "liberty" which Paul seems to have been gospelling almost alone to the "captive Gentiles."

St. Paul more than once particularizes that though the "speaking with tongues" be *miraculous* proof of "endowment of ABILITY out of Highest," yet that the speaker "without charity," or love, is "nothing." See his wonderful 1 Cor. xiii. *in connexion with* ch. xii. Then, having regard to the wonderful *differences* exposed by Gal. ii. and elsewhere, compare the discrepancy of conduct and behaviour with the behest in the Gospel. "*Sit ye down* in the city Jerusalem until," says the Gospel; "Stay about, or *cling to*, the upon-fluence of the Father which ye heard of from Me, *Item*,——and," or "but," too, "says the Acts i. 4, 5. But, behold! *before Pentecost*, "in those *very* days, having stood up, Peter in the midst of the disciples said, εἶπεν, proposed," &c., among the 120! They were told to "sit down," in the old *polity* Jerusalem; "scarcely to be without-ed from it," *thus and so* "clinging to the onfluence of the Father which ye heard of from Me, *Item*," &c.; but yet "Peter *stood up* and made his proposition"; well might Paul, like another *Elisha*, afterwards be "*called!*" Gal. i. 1. And yet St. John in Apocalypse speaks but of "the TWELVE Apostles of the Lamb," not of *thirteen!*

Note 6. Hence then the being "endued ABILITY out of Highest," and the mighty phenomena at Acts ii. 2–4, though concomitant, synchronous, if even homologous or identical, are *but* "the onfluence of the Father (which) I do apostle UPON YOU"; exalted, or intensified, as it may well be by the SON'S so *apostling* it like another *Parent's doing* it. These "cloven tongues SAT UPON each one of them," and "they,

quite all, were filled of Spirit holy, and began to talk with other tongues [ἑτέροις] just as the Spirit did give them to be bawling forth." And yet the effect was not then necessarily the same as with Saul, Gal. i. 16, nor as with Mary, with whom the same Power operated so as to beget "the Son," Luke i. 35. *Was* her fiducial and beautiful correspondence with Them, and to the angel, i. 38, awanting as yet *in these?* *Did* that their like correspondence with these same Powers accrue "*not amidst* these many days"?

Subsequent history shews it; and the Grammar anticipates it. In "Acts" and Gospel it is ἐφ ὑμᾶς, or ἐφ' ἕνα; but at i. 35, it is ἐπ'-, ἐπι σε, ἐπ-', σοι, without direct prep. in this last instance. I leave this as a study for those who think Paul was too fond of *prepositions;* suggesting at same time that he most truly perceived the importance of *cases*— upon *the issue of* their "communion" with the said 'prepositions.'

Note 7. Read the first sentence of Note 6 again. I purposely wrote '*but*' "the onfluence of the Father," *although* "I do apostle it *upon* you." Now *hetera-wise* all this, and suppose all this to be the — what shall I say, *offluence, i. e.* '*on-fluence*' *generative,* of "the Son," "apostled" by the Father! No! that is not true orthodoxy. Suppose then the "onfluence" of the Father" which we "cling to" in the polity or policy, or city, of "the above Jerusalem," to be *magnified* by Big Spirit's apostling of it, so enhanced *as the Influence of the Son,* as the very *Influent of* υἱοθεσία, or *Son-ship-right,* — apostling of It "TO US"; — will we correspond to it so as to advance from τεκνα, *products,* to υἱοὶ "*sons,*" or very *links, copulates,* and *copulas?*

Note 9. The vast Wonder of Acts ii. goes on; "and ex-stasied were all, and marvelled," ver. 7. "They were ex-stasied too, and did divide in their extremity of resource," for explanation, ver. 12. *This* is the opportunity for Peter's

getting in 'the lever end of the wedge.' The "zeal" of Peter we pass over; but God saw the *niche* in the people's ex-stasy, and then Peter's 'Sermon,' founded on a Fact, sufficed. He quoted "the Psalms," before; now he quotes "the Prophets" — Joel; and it remained for Paul, the Apostle of Gentiles, to quote no less than Moses, "the Law-giver," long afterwards.

There is something much more wonderful in this, if duly regarded, than in the disciples, "quite all, beginning to talk in strange tongues." The thought is a perfect study for Law-y-ers and Ritualists! For God had long before said, "I will magnify My Law, and make it honourable," *valuable*. Not indeed by any fulsome or perfunctory extravagancies of it; but by culminating it, and *otherwis-ing* it, as *virtually* a "new" Law. See Heb. viii. 6–13, quoting the *Lamenting* Jeremiah. So St. John has to say in his first Epistle, "I write not a new Impulse, or *Instinct*, ἐντολη, to you, but the same ye had from the beginning"; yet it has a *newness* which is wholly relative, casual.

But there is no mistake about it here! It is not merely 'casuistical.' Peter's 'sermon' was wonderful, and wonders were worked through it; and it may be too that the *sermon worked* wonders. He winds up with "ἀσφαλῶς, then, let all the house Israel be knowing [*i. e. mind-knowing*], *Item*, Lord and Christ Him the God made, This the Jesus whom YE crucified." Note; "all the house Israel"; comp. ver. 14, 22, 29. The first of these references, ver. 14, opens grandly: "Men, Jews or Judæans, AND the dwelling *ones in* Jerusalem [*who might be proselytes, Romans, strangers of all those named before*], quite all, let this to you be knownable, and put ye yourselves in your ears my 'words,' *facts*," &c. Ver. 22 restricts, to "men Israelites"; 29, "men, brethren"; 36, "all the house Israel." There is here, to say the least, a remarkable fluctuation of *embracement*; so that who the

"they" of ver. 37 may comprise, any more than of 1–4, who *of us* shall *elect!*

I think I have seen in some early pictures a representation of this scene in which the "cloven fiery tongues" were "*sat upon*" the supposed "eleven" Apostles *only*. This idea of monopoly is of very early date; yet this passage would most expressly repudiate such a thought. So, as to all later exaggeration of assumed consequences, the case of Caiaphas at John xii. 47–52, should serve to prove that no *investiture* nor even *reception* of Holy Ghost, officially, amounts to, nor even secures, a *conception* of It, personally. Some persons perhaps infer that therefore we have the greater security for the accuracy of what "Apostles" "handed down," and hence the force of the doctrine of 'Inspiration.' Be it so; but at any rate the majority of us will accord our *belief* only to those Writings which credibly carry *their own signs-manual.* And further we can from History, suppressed, mangled as it has been, *believe* in a Personal spread of this same High Onfluenee *quite outside the pale* of 'Orthodoxy,' as in the time of Elias.

Ver. 37. "Having heard, too, they were thoroughly pricked *to* the heart; said [*proposed*] too towards the Peter and the rest Apostles (ver. 14) — "What shall we do, men, brethren?" Clearly, the same affluence of the Big Spirit which "sat upon" the *heads* of the disciples, and "filled them full quite all" of them, and "endued" them all "ABILITY" to be "beginning to talk from within outwards in "strange tongues," may have "pricked" *these others* deeper, even "*to* the *heart.*" The case is a remarkable obverse of the case of Cornelius and his household afterwards. The first cry *here*, when "the heart is pricked," is the true cry of Nature, "What shall we do?" In the case of Cornelius, there is no *cry, but* the *doing* is of long

standing; so they *respond* "as well as we," to the Jews' great marvel!

Peter's reply to this ardent, burning cry, is remarkable; a complete fusion of "*the* Law" and the Gospel. "Have wondered ["*repented*"] ye [*all*] and let there be baptized each of you UPON THE NAME of Jesus Christ unto *absention* of 'sins,' and ye will have been self-receiving the dowry of the Holy Spirit; for to you is the *on-fluence,* and to your bairns, and to all those unto far off, such as haply shall, or *will,* Jehovah our God be calling towards."

To dissect this reply is to torture it, when God had blessed *the sermon.* Nevertheless, its *far-fetched-ness,* if not even *confusion,* to all but Jews is very notable, when compared with Paul's sermon at Lystra, to Gentiles *probably* only; which sermon of Paul, however, it is fair to note that he preached *after* the event at xiii. 2.

Finally, then, *at that time of day,* we see much of the petty *wonderful* in favour of Ritualism; and *still too,* where, and "*while the first tabernacle has stasis,* — until the time of διορθωσις, or *right-direction.*" But we see also, especially as it becomes magnified in his career, that Paul so saw the great danger of it, that he practised, preached, and recorded, "*the more excellent way by far.*" What then shall be said — rather felt — at the revival of the former *now?*

We recur then to John the Baptist, his *practice* and his *heralding.* He *practised* "baptism in water"; but at the same time said that he himself, and much more his baptism, "was not worthy to be compared" (2 Cor. iv.) with Him and His, that were coming after him and his.

So he "*heralded,*" that "He shall baptize *with* Holy Spirit and Fire, whose fan is in His hand." "*Fan!*" What for? Call it "*besom*"; call it '*mop.*' It is to *blow away* what can be blown; it is to *sweep* up cinders, ashes; it is

to *mop up* messes and offal — as after every and all *bloody* sacrifices. For "baptism," especially "baptism of wonder," produces from us enormous scum, sordes, debris, rubbish. It all goes away, is "sent away"; the road is *made clear* for "again-genesis-ing." And then, may be, some of the old rotten materials are the very pabulum for the new scion, though this last is not the further Scripture figure about *us;* which is "*ingrafting.*" Indeed the figures in Scripture are numberless. But the main result, as affecting us, is, that The Christ Jesus does "become to us wisdom, exactiness, holifulness, and ex-emption, or *abs-emption.*" "There is none other name given under heaven among men whereby we may be made safe." "And, My *very* glory, *opination,* or *gloire,* I will not give to another." "Paul may plant," says he, "and Apollos water"; but "who is Paul? or who is Apollos? but ministers ("deacons") by whom ye believed?"

Section 16.

This last cited text from Isaiah is so pregnant and emphatic that one cannot help looking at this Acts ii. once more, because it is the first *public* "*Act*" of the now '*Apostolic* Church.' The first *private Apostolic* "Act," in which certainly the whole of the then little Church of "about 120 souls" concurred, namely, the casting of lots about Matthias or Barsabas, we above looked at; and we found it suspicious as to its validity in "obedience." But then we found from St. Paul's "more excellent way" that the *less* "excellent way" of officialism, such as was effectual in Caiaphas over Jesus, might, at least among Jews, be efficient as heretofore. Thus Dean Wordsworth makes a good deal of this passage (Greek Test. *in loco*), accepting even the reading ἀσμένως, though with doubt, but omitting, with Alford, and *Cod. Sin.*, φησιν.

1. The introduction of φησιν after μεταν-, for the rejection

of which Dean Alford shews good grounds in its varied position, looks like *a purpose to exclude a thought*, such as occurred to me before I discovered its objectionableness. The thought is that as John talked of "baptism of wonder," or repentance, so here "have wondered ["*repented*"] ye," *included* the "*being baptized* of each one of you." This *may* obviate the convenient explanation about the 3000, by Dean Wordsworth, &c. It is, to say the least, mystical, that the idea of "baptism" in the young Church *must* involve the idea of "water," as the necessary precursor of the higher baptism, &c.—nay, in the case of Cornelius, as the regular complement of it!

2. The first impression produced is κατεν. την καρδιαν εἰποντες προς — "they were [2d aor. pass.] compunctioned the heart-wise [*if accus. abs.*] saying [*i. e.*, "*proposing*] towards, or at, Peter and the left apostles [*i. e.*, *those that were left*]," &c.

Now here the verb being *passive*, it seems as if τὴν κ. must be 'accusative absolute,' as if '*instrumentative*.' It is much *easier* indeed to read τῇ καρδίᾳ, the *dat.* or *locative*; but this perhaps leaves the very opening for *human*, though apostolic, (*i. e.*, *Peter's* solely as the speaker,—) *ingenuity* which the *accus. abs.* would exclude. Why not these *hearers* endowed with the δυναμιν ἐξ ὕψους "power from on high," E. V., which, from the impatience (named in ch. i.), of some of the eleven or of the 120, "*slipped by*" *them* [Heb. ii. 1,] and entered *others*; and so, too, these among them; enabling them to *hear* "heart-ways,"—as well as "the fill of Holy Spirit" in the "Church" enabled *them* to "*talk?*" For it is most certain that "*those opining to be* pillars" had got astray somehow by the time they were all together at Antioch, when Paul had to set them straight! Gal. ii. When this obliquity began, unless even from the very first (Acts i.), and how far it extended, it is very hard to say, or even imagine.

To my mind, the salient features of this *chap. ii.* amount to proof of the then and there verification of that great text from Isaiah above cited: viz., that even "Apostolical" authority should "*not*," be the "*another*," (nor therefore even *now* an *Iterate*, ἕτερος,) to whom "God would give His glory." So far too it seems to support note 1.

3. The word ἀσμένως before ἀποδεξ is very peculiar; only Luke uses it; and that only at Acts xxi. 17, unless in this questioned place also. It is very much to be noted that in xxi. 17, not only is the verb ἐδεξ, but it very remarkably serves to collate the "*logos*" of this Peter's first public 'Sermon' and exposition, and the arrival of Paul with his friends from Ephesus at *Jerusalem*, the fountain-head.

The admission of the word to the Text at ii. 41 is questioned; Wordsworth saying it is rejected by certain 'originals,' 'perhaps rightly;' and Alford calling it '*a gloss*.' Lachm., Tisch., *Cod. Sinait.*, and Vulgate all reject it. If the "wonder," which, I conceive, "baptized them," and they "were pricked, the heart-wise," it beomes hard *thus early* in their "compunction" to understand ἀσμένως in any usual sense; and therefore, it seems to me, as not only a very suspicious 'gloss,' but the suspicion does not halt at the word alone. For, any "*gladness*," or *pleasure* derivable on first *conviction*, seems impossible to conceive; and if any do accrue, it must arise from some collusion, or from some extremely ill-judged '*kindness*'—as we are apt to deem it, instead of "letting patience have her perfect work." Such "gladness," too, procured by *water*-baptism "of each one," could be but a 'blind'; even if expedient on *political* grounds, as may be urged. I cannot but think Phil. iii. 17–21, as peculiarly allusive to this very probable delusion and damage.

Etymologically, whatever the word, as derivable from ἡδυς, ἡδοναι, may have of "gladness," *sweetness*, &c., being

ill-suited, in both passages as I believe; I would much rather look at ἀδημονεω, or ἀδην, as its kin; and then, if admitted, render our word, '*sadly*.' This is peculiarly suitable to the latter passage, Acts xxi. 17, as the remainder of that chapter shews. So in this our passage, *if* the word is to be admitted, this *contrary* sense to E. V., and this "*sadness*" with the '*wonder*,' would —— they being already "pricked the heart-wise," be a big "Baptism," without water. Indeed, the remainder of Peter's address there, ver. 38, 39, contains two or three peculiarities; such as ἐπὶ τῶ, and the forthcoming, or *future*, 'catching of' "the dowry of the Holy Spirit"; and "the On-fluence," which we have seen to be "the *Father's*," and its compass; to which he refers.

Whatever then 'Early Church'—aye, even *thus* 'Early'—*meant* by "baptism in water," I cannot but think from St. Paul's almost objection to it, that he, as *afterwards* Peter when he compared the "drowning of the old world" to it, deemed it quite otherwise than anything which should swell into the '*holy water*' fiction and "gladness." In fact, when St. Paul so invariably connects it more or less directly with "*death*"—as "baptism into death,"—it appears certain that he regarded it as a *destructive* rite; as all "the Law" infractions legitimately claimed. Whereas he rather uses the word λουτρόν as of "a *wash*, Bath, of *again-genesis-ing*," when the "way" has been "prepared" by "the pedagogue."

In this mode of explanation his Gentile-reasoning should be most cogent to us; for he came by birth and training from Insiders to Outsiders, Outcasts. And he says, 'For Christ sent me [*apostled me*] not to baptize, *i. e.*, to *destroy*, but to evangelize—*i. e. well-angel-ize*; as if the former were to *ill-angelize*, except as a mean from opposition to a further *End-initiative*, which is beyond its reach. I think ver. 43 supports this, —— "there was genesis'd to every

'soul,' FEAR," &c. So ver. 44, "all those *believing* or 'faithing,'" not "*believed*" E. V.; that is, the "*ability* out of Highest" was *within them*; the "Onfluence" is universal. Yet, as Peter said, "the receiving the dower of the holy Spirit *was future*," though his language connects as if cause and effect; whereas, as we have seen from i. 5, probably the one or the other was still future even to Peter and to some of "the others." We are almost compelled in fairness to God Himself, or to His Word, to think so, from the recorded events of the then following twelve or fifteen years in the said "Apostolick" 'Early Church.' This first epithet occurs in the *Nicene Creed* only, not in the earlier so called '*Apostolic*' creed.

As to the two '*churches*' (for Acts xix. 25, 29, 32, 39, 41, sufficiently shew what the meaning of the word really is) in their true religious character in respect of means and aims, they are placed in the fullest and strongest contrast in that fine passage, Heb. xii. 18–29. And again, in the most warning terms, at Philipp. iii., throughout; but where shall we look for *life-like* "witnesses" now of its ver. 7, 8? There are such indeed, and their *works* shew that they "cannot be hidden," though they are the *silent* or Sion-folk; "a people, not a people"; and they are "shewing to us the more excellent way" than the most extravagant or the most insinuating Ritualister can ever dream of obtaining now, except through a wide-spread ignorance, existing to its shame, after 1800 years of room and scope and power to counteract it.

Section 17.

There are two passages of great expression which may be well discussed, inasmuch as obscurity seems to hang about them, as Dean Stanley's notes thereon declare. They seem

perhaps incidentally, rather than intentionally, to shew what St. Paul's view of the intent of "*baptism*" really was originally; or rather of the "*being baptized*"; for it is much to be noted that the 'abstract' word *baptisma* does not once occur in either passage. This is the more observable because two analogous 'abstracts' do occur in the latter of these two passages.

The first is that at 1 Cor. xv. 12–34. I submit that there is not a "digression" at this verse; and that if there appear to be such it is mainly due to our lowered view of "*baptism*." For, again, if we consider the main subject of the chapter, — which is precisely that which he treated of in the first "Epistle" he ever wrote, 1 Thess. iv. 13–15, and by the same pregnant word — "*laid asleep*," "*sleeping*," as contrasted with "*we the living*" —; and the connexion of the passage from νεκρωσις, or from ὑποταγησις to ἀναστασις, is there even aught of "abruptness," indeed even transition of thought as if from one subject to another? If "*baptism*" were factually what actually it pretends to be, there would not be, I suppose, the least foothold for such a question.

Having re-asserted the great premisses in verses 3–8, the Apostle comes, in verse 12, to the great dogma ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν, "a *re-stasis*, or *up-stasis* of *corpses*." This is the translation of these words. In ancient times, *e. g.*, in Homer, the word νεκρός, = νέκυς, meant the ghosts or 'persons' of the departed, as if all one with their bodies; but afterwards it specially meant the *corpses*. And it is thus we must understand it here. Compare Acts xvii. 18, not only as to these words, where however τὴν ἀνάστασιν "*the up-stasis*," seems to be deemed itself one of the "strange Gods," but as to the *Person* "preached" at Athens — "the Jesus," as distinct from "the *up-stasis*." Whereas here, in our premisses we have χριστὸς ἀπεθανεν, E. V. "*Christ died*."

The possible connexion between *this* verb-radical and νέκυς has been already hinted at. If, with somewhat of a *Hebrew* bias, we examine Liddell and Scott on the articles θε, θα, νε, νη, and the etymological references under νέκυς, and θνήσκω, even a probability will not seem far-fetched.

Moreover, when we read, at Acts xvii. 18, that Paul's "preaching" "*the anastasis,*" or "re-surrection" of E. V., "seemed to be a setting forth of a strange God,"—for observe that there we have not ἀνάς. νεκρῶν, or ἐκ νεκρῶν, *anastasis of* or *from corpses,* or *out of* or *out from, corpses,* but the distinct and separate word ἀνας. *anastasis.* Seeing this, I say, is it *quite certain* that the etymology of this word is ἀνα and ἵςημι? Seeing the modern Italian *stato* as auxiliary to the subst. verb *essere, to be,* and remembering the conversation between our Lord and Martha, John xi. 23–26, one is somewhat prepared to see even *very being* thus implicated in the word; but how then about the prefix ἀνα-, as '*re*'-, = *again,* or '*up*'? The reply must be that the condition supposed is wholly *relative;* that is, that because we do not *see* 'the departed,' therefore it follows not that they are *not in being. To our apprehension* this said *anastasis* may be verily a *re-habilitation;* but are we competent, adequate judges of *the absolute?* That something analogous to this is meant by the term *anastasis,* or "resurrection," seems to have been the prevailing idea to this day; and is to the *eye* the certain etymological meaning and intent of the word.

While however the "law was taken at the mouth of the priest" by the *ear,* and the eye less familiar with writing, the power of accentuation in reading, besides that of 'tone,' must have been great. Of course to us it may look ridiculous and absurd to suggest ἀ *priv.* and ναίω, as elementaries of ἀνάςασις; for that νάςης, νάςις are the nearest approach we

can make, regularly. Yet comparing 2 Cor. v. 1–4; that "the son of the man hath not where to lay his head"; the apparently general notions about the 'departed' as distinguished from the defunctioned or 'defunct'; and one clause of the passage we are about considering, with the Hebrew idea in *Goël;* it may *seem that there may be* something in this strange conceit. *Lazarus* was *un-housed* "from among the dead," ἐκ νεκρῶν, as well as *rehabilitated* among the living, when he was recalled, resuscitated, resurrected.

In the very remarkable, though 'apocryphal' story of the "seven brethren with their mother," recorded at 2 Macc. vii., there is a striking expression at verse 14, which shews a varying idea from what afterwards prevailed. At Acts xxiv. 15, we read of a "hope which they themselves also allow [προσδέχονται], that there is on the very point of being, *anastasis* of corpses, of right-eous *ones* as well as of unright *ones*." Whereas here, at 2 Macc., the fourth of these seven tortured brothers says to the cruel Seleucus—"It is preferable [αἱρετον] that *a man* μετάλλασσοντα [*undergoing the exchange of the*] hopes from men, look to [προσδοκεῖν] the hopes under the God, that again he be *resuscitated, rehabilitated, resurrected,* [πάλιν ἀναςήσεσθαι] under Him; for to thee indeed *anastasis, rehabilitation;* into life there shall, *or will,* not be:" [! !] The word occurs again at 2 Macc. xii. 43 —"doing *therein* altogether well and astutely, over *anastasis* discussing; for unless he looked to [προσεδόκα] that those before-fallen be *anastased, it were* superfluous and silly over corpses to be vowing [εὐχεσθαι]." The next verse has its own peculiarities, which we need not here meddle with, though very suggestive.

Now these two passages seem to shew that *anastasis* had *two relative* senses; or as if, being but one, it were regarded from two points of view. Thus ἐγέρσις in N. T. seems

implied as the analogue, although this abstract occurs only once (Matt. xxvii. 53), the verb itself being usually required.

The former of the two passages from 2 Macc. has παλιν ἀναϛ., which seems to prove that ἀνα- cannot = "*re-*," which is already expressed by παλιν; so that probably it has its usual and general sense of *up*. The Lexicon refers the word to the *passive*, ἀνίϛαμαι; but if our previous surmises about these words in σιϛ hold good, as I believe they will, both it and ἐγέρσις are to be referred to the first *aor. active*. Otherwise, analogy with E. V. would require *resurrecture* like nature, creature, &c., which certainly is not correct, or a future verb would not be required with it. Our nearest English synonyme, I believe, for -σιϛ is *-tion*, as in crea-*tion*, na-*tion;* hence, here we should have sta-*tion*, but not *state*, nor *standing*. This, however, being unsatisfactory, let *stasis*, '*up-stasis*,' be accepted for *anastasis*, and *arousal* for ἐγέρσις.

Again, the possible distinction should be maintained, which E. V. hardly does, between ἀναϛ. νεκρῶν and ἀναϛ. ἐκ νεκρῶν. The former undoubtedly means "*upstasis of* corpses" *themselves;* the latter, "*upstasis from*" (E. V.) or "*out of, out from*, corpses." The reservation then implied in our great passage of 1 Cor. xv., cannot be too much dwelt upon by all who believe in the very Deity of our "Lord Jesus," as "CHRISTOS." Collate herewith, too, one of the great *items* we shall meet with in the very premisses of the "Gospel," in ἐτάφη, under τεθηπα, as well as θάπτω; and for the same purpose the careful expression παραπλησίως μετέσχε at Heb. ii. 14, respecting "Jesus," ver. 9; but at the same time, 1 Pet. iii. 18, respecting "CHRISTOS." Seeing that all these refer to One Personalty, it is not easy to conceive otherwise than as the 'Nicene Creed' expresses this article,

'God *of*, or *out of*, God —— Very God *of*, or *out of*, Very God.'

Further, in E. V. there is a want of due regard to, not only the exact force of the *tenses*, but of the *voices*, of verbs. It is all very well, probably, to disregard them with respect to such persons as "know" all about the subject matter in hand; but the Bible is for 'sinners,' and for such as are learners. This remark will apply very especially to the verbs of the abstracts we have just named in our passages at 1 Cor. xv. But, in a collateral passage, John v. 28, 29, note the phrase, "*shall come forth*," of E. V., where the Greek is ἐκπορεύσονται, "they that are in the tombs shall be hearing [*midd.*] of His 'voice,' and shall, or *will*, be marched out, wended out, — or, '*be marching, wending*,' *out*," &c. I admire our wonderful Version as much as any one; wonderful, indeed, when we consider the fewness of resources for translation compared with what we have; yet cannot but see its utter inadequacy for accurate disquisition, for which the original Greek is so famously furnished. It is evidently intended that we should not take the Bible as a mere '*nostrum*,' just as some would swallow a quack doctor's pill.

Let us now attempt then to examine certain portions of this great chapter, 1 Cor. xv., connecting it, as we shall soon discover that the Apostle himself does, with the idea of *Baptism*.

In the first verse we have the declaration which comprises us *if we believe*, and are "*brethren*"; "I declare to you the Gospel — in which also ye have stasis, or *in which ye have taken or gotten standing*, — except if ye scarcely imaginarily believed *it*."

This distinction between '*stasis*' (or *being*?) and "*safety*," or "our *being saved*," bears out the translation of Eph. ii. 5, 8, which is above adopted.

Verse 3. "*Item;* CHRISTOS died away, ἀπεθανεν, over our sins," &c. This last clause may seem to supply a certain scope, or measure, or extent, to the ἀποθαν; a kind of *relative* truth which is suggestive of reservation to the limits of the *absolute*, the *possible*.

Verse 4. "And, *item*, He was buried"; collate above on this word. "And, *item*, He has been aroused on, or *by*, the third day," &c.

Verse 5. "And, *item*, He was seen," ὤφθη, &c.

These, certainly, are the fundamental propositions of "the Gospel." It is therefore of prime importance to know not only "What mean ye by this"? as Moses long ago anticipated that "your children in time to come would ask," but especially to know what the epithet and NAME, "CHRISTOS," signify; and whom it belongs to. This word *know* is a dangerous word to employ, as I have tried to shew in respect of its at least two-fold sense; but it must be used because current, and one must hope for a correct acceptation of it.

Our Lord Himself proposed a corresponding thought for and to the Jews: "What opine ye of The *Christos?* Of whom is He Son?" He then cites Psalm cx. so as to shew that "David himself calls Him *my Lord*," אדני, which the Lexicons refer to דון, and אדון. If this be correct one cannot help thinking that we have the very word in the Greek δυν-αμις; whence δυν-ατὸς and χρις-ὸς may be synonymes. From some cause our English *Name* is a departure from all analogy; because whereas we say *Christ*-mas, *Christ*-ian, '*christy*-crosty,' yet we say *Christ*. The explanation may be that in old English the word would be *written* CHRIST-E, as if two syllables like the Greek and the Latin; but that being our common *idiomatic* way to the *ear*, of lengthening the first and main vowel, it has now become *one* syllable. See however as tc the Greek quantity under χρῖω in L. and S.

Probably our now two-syllable word *righteous* was origi-

nally of three syllables — *right-e-ous;* the *e* being the representative of the *iota-subscriptum*, when promoted, as in *-ία*, as we before surmised respecting this. Compare the German *reicht.* These *vowels*, through the ignorance and perhaps indifference of "the people," have been from of old wholly monopolized by the priests and the learned. Compare *night*, from *noct-*, *sight*, from *see*, &c. Evidently, *as* of yore, "belief cometh by *hearing*," *so* the "Priesthood" is responsible for what prevails, "whether bad or good," as well as, or more than, the '*never-mind*'*-ish-ness* of 'the Vulgar.' But, these *profane*, that stand *before the Fane* have a 'common sense' as brilliant and acute as those within; and perhaps a far keener appetite for the "*What mean ye*"? And if they be brought thereby to the front entrance of the Fane, and are disappointed, will it not be like "the blood of Abel crying out from the ground" into the ears of the Lord God of Sabaoth?

It will be a great study to see how the three Evangelists put our Lord's question into words; see Matt. xxii. 42; Mark xii. 35; Luke xx. 41; and then to search how, and why, and what means the record that "*the disciples were called Christi-ans first at Antioch*"? And again, what Paul meant to the Galatians by — "*until there be formed* CHRISTOS *in you*"? Collate Gal. v. 1, 2, both anarthrous with verses 4 and 6. The word, though now a *Name*, is purely an epithet properly; though doubtless with propriety now restricted to "the Lord Jesus." But what must be, or ought to be, the *stasis* of those who *truthfully* can so restrict it? To be *the truth*, even *to belief* by us, much is involved beyond *what seems to be.*

Moses's anticipated question was, "*What mean ye by this*"? "*This*"; — say, "the Gospel," or *fair message;* of which St. Paul states these four 'articles,' or *items:* as we call them, too, of our 'creed,' though expressed perhaps

in more precise terms. For, whereas we say, "was crucified," St. Paul here says ἀπεθανεν, "'*died*' away." Compare the expression — "*might be tasting of* death," θανάτου, Heb. ii. 9. All however is amply defended by Luke xxiv. 26, 27, 44–48, if defence be needed. Still, the construction of our verse 4, which contains *two items*, is peculiar; for, "according to the *Graphs*," or *Scriptures*, is not repeated after ἐτάφη, "*he was buried*," as after the other items. The ready answer may be that the third *item* implies the second. Well; perhaps Psalm xvi. 10, and Isaiah liii. 9, warrant this answer; still, note that the third *item* has no perf. pass. or other form of ἀνίςαμαι, but reads ἐγήγερται, "*has been aroused*"; not has been *up-stasis-d*. It is thus that Psalm xvi. 9, 10, becomes so pregnant. But it is thus also that the Evangelist John seems to have been induced to write (xix. 28–42) with such ample and particular detail. He meets thus the insinuations of the *Docetæ* on the one hand, who opined all this to be *in seeming* only, and of the *Gnostics* on the other, who professed to *know*, or to *have notioned*, all about it.

Now I have followed thus diffusely into this thesis, because, while in this high field of the Deity we all are ready to condemn *both* these ancient parties, yet in the lower sphere of the Humanity we still seem to have modern Gnostics and Docetæ in abundance; if not even as *the Regulars*. Just as our Lord said, "*I have a baptism to be baptized*," and thus in very truth and act and fact it was "accomplished"; yet *Docetism* and *Gnosticism* largely prevailed; because, in truth, we cannot conceive of Deity being "subjected to vanity," or fatuity; so do these principles seem to prevail now respecting the "baptism" of men. Officialism seems to '*know*' all about it, and so its subjects have contented themselves to *opine* all about it; both avowing *belief*; and so, too, *this* "baptism" is "accomplished"! Can it really be so, that any of us "have thus learned THE

CHRISTOS?" It is ridiculous, insulting, to urge on the common mind here that these things must "be spiritually discerned," when the officials send us, or let us go, adrift with a sprinkling of 'holy water,' as if we were thus *safe*. No real Shepherd would thus tend his sheep, even for '*foot-rot*.' We are seduced, or induced, or allowed to spend thousands on our Churches and Mausoleums, and other quack medicines, proving that a Theocracy and Credulity are rife as ever! What *a system!*

If the previous pages hold good, one must deem the "*baptism of* WONDER," which John heralded to and for US, to have its true prototype in these two *items* of the "*Christos.*" I have already noted that *ἀπο-θαν*, absolutely, is measurable by *ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμ. ἡμῶν* "over our 'sins,'" relatively; that is, that inasmuch as it is *ὑπὲρ over, exceeding*, &c., it is also *ἀπὸ, away*, in respect of *θαν-*. THEREFORE the "*burial*" of "the body of the Jesus" (John xix. 38-40), "*pierced with a lance*," as it was, is regular.

Thus indeed of "*the body* of the Jesus," but what of "the Jesus" *Himself*, or *His Self*? It is here that the other sense of *ἐταφη* comes in respecting "CHRISTOS." He was '*stunned*,' '*astounded*,' '*benumbed*,' &c., as is said also at Isa. lix. 16, lxiii. 5, "WONDERED"; passages which must be studied to get an idea of their intense meaning. So, answerably, "*Baptism*" must be, if it correspond. All *docetism* and *gnosticism* are most pernicious cheats here. *Belief*, however, can apprehend it,—ap-prehend; yet collate xiii. 2, of this very Epistle at the same moment. We call it "faith" now. It behoves us to be wary betimes, lest, when we come to the last, we find we have put 'the cart before the horse'! It is not too late for "hope" even then, even in the very 'article of death'; but, for those who do really "die daily," to witness the *life* of such pretension, and yet to espy its falsity, it must be a daily torture!

Now these several *items* were here "declared," or *notified* by the Apostle here in this chap. as proof of ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν, "*upstasis of corpses*"; compare Rom. viii. 23, "our *body*," not *bodies*. And after large expansion of this proof, or these proofs, he comes in with ver. 29; surely not still to look '*abrupt*,' or a '*digression*.' Recall, as elucidatory, the second of the passages above cited from 2 Maccabees.

29. "Else [ἐπεὶ] what shall, *or will*, they do that are being baptized [or, *are baptizing themselves*] over THE corpses? If, wholly [*utterly, altogether, entirely*] corpses are not aroused, why also are they baptized [or, *baptizing themselves*] over THE corpses?" I do but hint here, by type, at the implication of the present or absent *article*.

Now the passage from Macc. shews the then idea, which seems to be exactly the same as the modern Romish; 2 Macc. xii. 43–46; where we have the remarkable phrase, ἀποκείμενον χαριστήριον — "*a laid-away Charistery*." Thus, with "the 2000 drachmas of silver," Judas "was making, ἐξιλάσμον, *off-ransom-ful*, about [περὶ] them that had died [τεθνηκοτων], that the 'sins' be absolved." And the writer calls it θυσιαν, "*sacrifice* about sin," ver. 43; or rather, perhaps, προσαγαγειν, *it was* "*to lead to*," or, *with respect to*, that. It seems clear, then, that "baptism over" one, was deemed *tributary to* or *for* that one; or, in modern phrase, *complementary* and *beneficial*, — say at once, *solacing*.

Now there is in this verse an *argumentum ad absurdum* suggested, only suggested. Either such "baptism," as "baptism" had now come to be, was, to use the words of the Macc. writer, "*superfluous and silly*," if "corpses are *not* aroused," or "the corpses," *i. e.* such as verily are corpses, were not very likely to be benefitted by it and such *votary-ism*.

30. "*Why do even* WE *hazard*, or *risk, every hour?*" when, "*if in this the life* [ζωη] *we have been hoped* [*hoping?*] *in*

Christ only," "*every hour*" is most precious? Here is "*baptism*" *in posse* by contrast to the former; but that is not its full characteristic of *in esse*.

Ver. 31. "Day by day, or *regularly as the day comes*, do I die away, ἀποθνησκω; nay it is our own very boast which I have [*hold*] in CHRISTOS, Jesus our Lord." *This* really and only is "Baptism," or rather a "*being baptized*," or "*baptizing one's self*," in St. Paul's view; as he had previously shewn it by proofs for belief taken from our Lord's history.

The "silliness" of the baptizings then practised is there enhanced by his quoting what appears to be a proverb, "*Let us eat and let us drink, for to-morrow we die away*"; though it specially contrasts with ver. 30. 'Why hazard or risk an hour?' Why ask such a question if real and true *baptismus* do not make it most pertinent? Well, well, indeed, may "*dying away daily be one's own boast*" for any man if he so "*hold it in Christos.*" We remember that St. James takes up this illustration about "to-morrow," in connexion with his argument for "*works*," as if to say "*do*" what you *can* "to-day," for you have not yet a "to-morrow." It is as if even he had hardly realized that "*belief*" is all but *a Creator*.

Altogether, from this great collation of subjects, and from the general tenor of St. Paul's Epistles it seems impossible to avoid the impression, derivable even from his avoidance and decrying of "Baptism," that he foresaw, almost from the first instant of his "*thorough change*," the dangerous character of it, and of all such "*beggarly elements*," and "*signs and wonders.*" Just as circumcision among the Jews degenerated into a politico-fœderal rite and badge, which could no more make a Jew than baptism can a Christian, or an 'uniform' a soldier; so is it to be feared lest, being so dignified, or dignitied, we presume upon "*the sign*" for '*the*

thing signified.' It quite suffices for St. Paul's *general* argument if in this fundamental region he can exhibit the real nature of this finial *particular*. The entire strain of the Epistle to the Galatians especially seems to be in this tone. Here, however, I have endeavoured to illustrate all *by* "*baptism.*"

In thus jumping to νεκρωσις, or a *being worked to death*, which, mind, can be done in one's "closet," as well as in "the world," a passage earlier in this same Epistle is omitted.

There are 'symptoms' of different stages in this *natural* de-naturalizing process, — certain *physical* symptoms which few but 'Doctors' are able to estimate, even approximately. I have no doubt that there are some — a few? — who do approximately estimate the process in a *spiritual* sphere, in what is called a '*spiritual*' sense. Yet still I venture to warn, *mind*, "*the analogy of the belief.*" The contemplation of such a scene must be most probing even to the said "few"!

But the passage alluded to gives again an interpretation of a *natural* stage in the history of the Israelites. You may consider it 'spiritually' if you will, and arrive at 'spiritual' conclusions from the already 'spiritualized' Apostolic interpretation; but pray let us try to retain the *natural* features, as the Apostle does. The process alluded to is from ὑποταγησις, or a being *broken in*, to ὑποταξις, *the resultant stasis;* which, indeed, is ἀλαλητος, *not* easily and readily *talked about*, beyond *probability*, but *to be acted.* Indeed, I question whether any living Language can fairly fully express this *Greek verbal.*

It is this which is *capitalized* as νεκρωσις, or *distinct sepa-rateness, corpse-ness, ghosti-liness,* in the passage

just examined. The passage is at 1 Corinthians x. 1, *et seq.*

The argument runs from chap. ix. "Every body striving, *agonizing himself as in the Festal Games*, is inwardly mastering himself,—*is 'in training.'*" So you see *me*, who am an Apostle, *me*, doing; which argues not my *insignificancy*, ἀδηλως, but the necessity of the discipline for the hope and probability of such a "prize." "FOR I do not will that you have ignored, brethren, *Item*, our fathers *even*, all, under a cloud were, and all through the sea came along, and all into the Moses baptized [*were baptized ?*] in the cloud and in the sea." As to the verb, *act.* or *pass.*, see Dean Stanley, inclining to the *active*, as "the natural expression of the voluntary pledge involved in Christian baptism"; that is, *they "subjected" themselves* to Moses and the risk of drowning. So, irrespective of this explanation, the *active* verb seems required as a parallel to the Apostle's own behaviour, which he so illustrates, and is instancing and defending; as it is also expressed by the Dean, "the whole history of the O. T. teaches us the lesson of distrust of ourselves"; but, adds the Apostle, 'TRAIN,' then.

Thus, "they all baptized unto Moses"; and Heb. xi. 29, says, "by belief they wended along the Red Sea as through [or *by means of*] dry ground"; whereas, wanting "belief," "the Egyptians essaying to do *the same*, were engulphed." So then, "*beliefd'd-able* as Moses in his 'wick' was (Heb. iii. 2), "baptism unto him," and "belief" (*undefined*, mark!) are equivalents; to define, we must say "*baptizing*," and "*believing*," are equivalents. Dean Stanley compares well, Ex. xiv. 31—"[*And the people feared Jehovah*] and believed Jehovah and His servant Moses."

In every point of view, (Deut. v. 28, 29,) Moses was not only μεσίτης, or "*Go-amidst*," but was the "city of refuge"

to them from the *Wonder*-ful, dreadful and terrible, both before *and behind,* on that occasion. Their betaking themselves to him, that is, their "*baptising unto him,*" was (not "faith," but) *belief;* it was the *motive power towards,* as is well singled out at Heb. xi. 29. And all this on their part was *natural,* after what they had seen in Egypt. Moreover it was *real,* as were "the cloud" and "the sea." It was *literal,* too, not only "spiritual," *spiritical,* or *spiritual-like,* as were the next instances — the βρωμα, "*meat,*" and the πόμα, "drink"; when "the Christ" was the Essence, the Spirit, of the whole, and the Pattern-Reality. The *first clause* of Ex. xiv. 31, secures *this* great feature of the application; just as the Apostle singles out besides "*fear,*" for "the children of the Israel," "*they believed,*" — = "*by belief,*" in Heb. xi. 29.

It will, doubtless, be difficult to concede "*belief*" to be a *natural* product, or "fruit," after reading Galat. v. 22, 23. Well; I cannot contend for it; and yet I can say "*I believe.*" We may puzzle ourselves here as to "*faith*"; but I doubt whether even "baptism" can make the analysis much clearer. St. Paul says "*by belief,* πιστει, or *belief-wise, they wended along the Red Sea as by means of dry ground*"; "THEY, *certainly,* wended along"; and did "*the Spirit*" move them so to do, or *Instinct,* Patriotism, Nationality, what not? And is not "Instinct" ever exhibiting itself in "fruits"?

However; "*by belief they wended along.*" In both passages, Cor. and Heb., the δια- *with accus.* is to be distinguished from διὰ *with gen.*; for Heb. xi. thus indicates by δια-, that the "*belief*" was the prompting, but also the sustaining, principle *all* "*along*" this perilous transit. The passage in Ex. makes no mention of "fearing" Pharaoh before they ventured; but, *after their transit,* we read the text quoted above — "*they believed*"; as much as to say, "*because they had seen they believed.*" The Apostle's words

are "*came along*," "*wended along*" — "the Red Sea"; he does not pry into antecedents, as we do; everywhere his method is "*forgetting the things behind, and reaching forth to those before, I press towards the mark for the prize.*" — With him, "*there is one baptisma,*" and that is final; anything succeeding is "day by day DYING AWAY"; as 1 Cor., xv. 30, *with* 31, above cited. But now, here, in 1 Cor. x. he virtually says, that this "belief" of "the children of the Israel," or perhaps rather the behaviour which sprung from the "belief," was a "*baptismus unto Moses*" *while* "in the cloud and in the sea;" and *legally* in issue, therefore, a *baptisma*. For all this was *real* and *natural* as well as also *ultra-natural;* this must be granted. Then, the *super*-natural comes in at verse 3, and is outside of the former figure; it just attaches as a context to, or belonging of, it — the *baptismus*. The Apostle keeps them quite distinct, as did Moses.

Who cannot but see, from even these two passages alone, how different was St. Paul's idea of 'Baptism' from that which has prevailed in 'the Church'? Or, who cannot fail to see from his early words in 1 Cor. i. 17, that he had discovered its dangerous pretension among everything else which was ritual and formal! After "thanking God" that he baptized only the two or three which he names, he adds, "*For not apostle me did Christ to baptize, but to evangelize*"; as if these were really *contrasts*. And he immediately adds, "*not in wisdom of* LOGOS"; as if this did really partake of this worldly-wise character, such as he ascribes also, in Coloss. ii. 23, to other formal schemes and practices.

In concluding this Section, I cannot suppress an early comment of my own. My illustration hangs as such on the theme of "*Baptism,*" which has perhaps now pretty well subsided into its politico-fœderal and 'civil' value. But

this is the finial and initial link of a long chain of consequences! I was not aware of it when I broached the subject, or might have shrunk from it. I do not feel at liberty now so to do.

Look at "Baptism" in a truly Religious point of view, as our forefathers were, and we are, instructed to do; then look at the font of 'holy water' and all the paraphernalia connected with it, however 'spiritually' all be invested; is there not an 'incongruity'? If, in a deep and high Religious sense this Rite, and all like it, *can* be now a cheat, or even "*superfluous and silly*," is it not dangerous? Where then is the Honesty to promiscuously practise it as a *Religious* Act? Can 'Confirmation' secure its validity? Be it granted that in the sphere of "Law," "*while as yet the first Tabernacle has stasis*," all is very fair so far as *prestige* and belief can make it so. Yet, after what we have seen, is it not desperately liable, nay likely, to foreclose that "*more excellent way*" which characterizes a "*brotherhood*" as from very *fellow-feeling?* — to lead to the vapid '*notion*' that all has been done, and all has been sustained, which it is in Human Nature either to do or to bear?

Section 18.

"*Faith*" *and Belief.*

Having experienced a difficulty, which is purposely manifested in the previous pages, in using these two words, and confident that they *ought not* to be synonymous, I have, lastly, tried to summarize the matter distinctly. For I am satisfied that great confusion arises, in disputation, by the promiscuous use of these words, whereby Popery can affect strength, and Protestantism certainly suffers defeat or detraction, unfairly. Nor in disputation only with others, but with one's own mind, is this damage brought about.

Is the Proposal too large, that, in *dialogisms* [διαλογισμοι], there is no *ultimatum* for appeal in the whole world comparable to 'the Bible'? In one sense, *certainly not;* but in another sense the reply of every rational man must be in the affirmative. For it is too great a demand on Reason to believe that such a Book would be presented from on High—(for in some shape or way or extent this *must* be conceded)—to Man even to tantalize him, unless there were some *corresponsive* to It in man, which therefore is also an analogous *ultimatum*. Are these fairly confronted one with the other? I believe neither fairly nor fully as they might be.

Take here only the instance of these two words as they are used in the English Version of the New Testament.

It is not an easy thing now to say in Biblical language what "Faith," as distinguished from "Belief," is exactly intended to mean. It is not perhaps too much to say that the word "*faith*" and its Theological *idea* are wholly Latin, if not even wholly *scholastic;* nor that in *ancient* Latin it really meant what we mean in our word *fidelity, faithfulness*, &c.; and therefore that all the modifications of the word as noun, adjective, or verb had this ruling idea. But this is certainly beyond the force of the Greek verb πιστεύω, '*I believe*,' to which πίστις '*belief*,' in all other cases would be the real correspondent. If they approximate even ever so closely, nay if the one run into the other, yet "*faith*," or *fidelity*, is the proper *respondent* to "*belief*," and not *identical*. How near they approximate may be perceived by noting the word "*obedience*" in E. V. For if ἀπειθεία = "*disobedience*," as it is always rendered in E. V., then πείθεια should mean *obedience;* that is, "faith," fidelity, "obedience," are all *evidences* of 'persuasion'; in fact they are "*works*." As, however, ἀπιστία is opposed to πίστις, so is ἀπειθεία to πεῖσις; and most correctly is this last word referable to πασχω, as well as to πείθω, that is, to *suffering* as well as *persuasion*. But either of these

ideas, whether as adjunct or consequent, is an advance upon πίστις, "*belief*."

Unhappily, too, the word "faith" now so occupies the field of language that the word "belief" has, in another direction, come to be confused with '*opinion*,' δοκησις; so that '*I am of opinion*,' or '*I think*,' or '*I believe*,' have become almost equivalent expressions. But this is further short of "*belief*" than the former is in advance of it. If πίστις, "*belief*," as St. Paul uses the word, were but equal to either of these, there does not seem room for St. James's comment on St. Paul's doctrine about it. Not on the score of "faith," *i. e. fidelity;* for Abraham's and Rahab's "*works*" do *constitute* their fidelity or "faith," becoming *proofs* of the motive "belief." Nor on the score of *opinion*, which few would deem a motive adequate to *fill out such* "works."

Neither is it very extraordinary that Abraham, '*persuaded*,' should have done so much as he did, though it be so that he '*suffered*,' for so much as he did. But neither *persuasion* nor *suffering*, both = πεῖσις, is that feature which St. Paul seizes upon; but πίστις, "*belief*," θεῷ, *God-ward* (*God-wise?*). As to this parenthesis, compare the case of Araunah, 2 Sam. xxiv. 23. "Belief," as the *motive*, not "Faith" or *fidelity*, the issuing "*work*, is that great Principle which St. Paul would *e-ducate*.

Now it is a very important question how far mischief is done to us, and disparagement to 'the Bible,' by strong appeals to "*faith*" or *fidelity*, πεῖσις, *persuasion*, which is essentially sensuous, if the term can be allowed, *before* its pioneer "*belief*," πίστις has been foundationed? My impression is that both are considerable. It seems indeed not improbable that very much of the so-called 'enthusiasm' in the world may be this frothy "*faith*." Such impression seems fortified by the absence of the word πεῖσις from the

entire N. T., though the *verb* occurs repeatedly. The nearest approach to it is πεισμονὴ at Gal. v. 8, "*persuasion*," E. V., a passage which quite shews its *dangerous delusiveness*. Look at the *verb*, as πείθω, where you will in St. Paul's writings and its strict sense will be *suavity, suasion, persuasion;* while as referred to πασχω — "even He, though He were a Son, learned obedience [ὑπακοην] by the things He *suffered*." In either of these places we may substitute the word *faithed, fidelity;* but in neither could we correctly use the word *believed, belief*.

To my mind it is no small corroboration of this view that we have in English no corresponding *verb* for "*faith*" without getting among the *fays* and *fairies* and so *to fay*. The word *fain*, = '*gladly*, seems to belong to it also; if so then 'I would *fain* do so and so,' means 'I would *persuade myself* to do so and so.' I cannot think such a fact as this absence of the verb to be the effect of mere *chance;* and *fashion* has nothing to do with the matter as if such verb were merely obsolete. The Latin, then, has not so prevailed as to foist such a verb as *fido* in our Language; and the existence of *credo* in the Latin, and its special ecclesiastical use (as in the word '*Creeds*') seems to render it probable that the adoption of *fido, fides*, as "*faith*" in its theological sense is chiefly scholastic, if not only English. And here is one proof of the deplorable consequence of our great Divines having adopted *Latin* as the vehicle for their great learning and pious thought. The exclusion of the mind of their countrymen was but ill compensated by the casuistry of such foreigners, equally learned as themselves, but less candid than their own people. It may be on this account that the poverty of the Latin in this same particular has prevailed over the common property of our own language, which is common with the Greek here. For both have a verb and a noun which *must* correspond in meaning; and yet our Trans-

lators, apparently by reason of the Latin Vulgate, have chosen to vary the translation of the one from that of the other. *Believe* and *belief* are the true synonymes for St. Paul's corresponding words. Indeed, so seemingly impossible is it for the Latin word *credo* to furnish a *noun*, and for the English word "*faith*" to furnish a *verb*, that one's mind reverts promptly to the story about Babel, at Gen. xi. 7, for a kind of judicial solution of the case! I suspect that the Romanists see the weak point of the harness in Protestant arguments which builds upon this very word; for whereas the one may mean in the abstract a *credo*, the other can play with a *fido*.

To obviate this, even among ourselves, we make the word "faith" to include '*the object believed*'; but we must not empty the word of such *object* at our pleasure. It thus includes '*cross*,' 'crucifix, or any other such Ideal; and then it becomes absurd at the same time to pretend to think of "*faith*" as an abstraction. There is not the least occasion for it even scholastically, I believe. All that is needed is to assign to "faith" its true place in theological nomenclature, if the word is to be used, as *quite distinct* from "belief"; and to give to "*belief*" its true value as the really vital *principle*. So difficult now however will this be found that, at any rate in reading N. T., the word "faith" were much better rejected altogether, and a word adopted instead of it which has a corresponding *verb*, such as *belief, believe*; the word '*trust*' is at fault just as "*faith*" is. The great Protestant axiom as opposed to Romanism is most exactly stated at Rom. iii. 28, and emphatically — "by BELIEF is justi-fied [*justi-ed*] Man separately from works of Law." The moment we go beyond "*belief*," πίστις, or, on the other hand, evade "*belief*," we have got among the *sensuous*; matters of "*faith*," "works" of any sort or degree, πεῖσις, the *persuasive*, where Romanism beats Protestantism hollow.

But with how much real rational satisfaction? I would apply here, Reader, two passages from the Epistle which I believe none but Paul *could* write. Please help me to your satisfaction.

"If the blood — '*which is the life*' — of bulls and goats, and the ashes — *which are the relicts of the sacrificial death* — of an heifer, sprinkling — *like Job's* "*dust and ashes*" — the unclean halloweth to the purgation of the flesh;" —— The "if" implies that, by "*belief*" of the Ritual of Divine appointment, these, by "the Law," *could* avail, *could* Man have been reached through "the flesh"; [which almost is *but* "*belief*," in this profound sphere where we are floundering.]

"If," *notwithstanding all this, these* "could not avail for the satisfying of the conscience" of him who, God-like, *believed* the spirit of the scheme; is it not an insult to 'common sense,' to Reason, to Man, to God, to pretend that any *screens* "after the doctrines and commandments of men" can prevail, *with Belief*, to the satisfaction of *Reason?* — that is, in the *ratio* of Man?

But, at any rate then, if we retain the word "faith," let us further try to thoroughly understand what it does *properly* mean, and what it does *not properly* mean.

There is no question about the word πεῖσις (*i. e.*, "*faith*," by my vocabulary,) belonging quite as correctly to πασχω as to πείθω.

If, then, we would throw these separable ideas into one word, "*faith*," we must, having adduced plentifully of the *persuasive* force of the word, include now also that of *suffering* as its true concomitant. Not, however, as a *volunteered* suffering "unto the glutting of the flesh," which is contradictory to any *persuasion* concomitantly — "the divine law" being witness — Rom. viii. 3; but, for instance, without offence, without defence, the "*suffering joyfully* the despoiling of your goods," if need be, "knowing [γινωσκοντες] to hold

in [*your*]selves a better *sub-original belonging* in heavens, and abiding." The word ὑπαρξις is a beautiful word; compare it as "*goods*," E. V., in Acts ii. 45, the only other place where it occurs; it may be rendered by the commercial '*good-will*.' All this goes; 'good will,' good name, good repute, and all the rest of it; this is "faith"! Why a man is more than half way to heaven or to hell with this amount of damage sustained!

But this is not all. "Forasmuch also as Christ suffered over us in the flesh," and as "our Pascha, was 'sacrificed' over us," that is, slaughtered, victimized; so we, under Him, are ready to "suffer the loss of all *things*, and do count them but dung so that we may win Christ and be found in Him." Sacrificed, vilified! And even then, *after* all this, the same word, as παθ-, the more *perf.* or *radical* form of the *aor.* πεῖσις, runs through all the N. T.; *assuming* that we be οἱ ὄντες, "*the in-being ones*," and οἱ ζωντες, "*the living* ones," we are the very *field* in which Christianity is to be descried by these very characteristics! This, sure enough, is "Faith"; but, as for the *persuasive* power of it, it cannot *originate* in Human Nature, though its effect can modestly *spring* out of it as a response. And, *because* of this beautiful resiliency of Humanity, shall "the God's *own* Body" tamper with it! Impossible, *with impunity!*

Yet what alone can, under God, hinder even persecution, then, as the *leging* yet supposed mode of "doing God service," and doing us good, by the sensualist, the formalist, the Ritualist, the Romanist, '*the faithful*' [!] but a vivid *Protestant* BELIEF — nothing more salient than *well-grounding Belief* — "set in array against" all that is se-ductive, with — if it must be so — "a valley between." Just fancy otherwise, David shaking hands with Goliath!

When Rome, which has studied Casuistry as a political Science from long ago, taunts us with our talk about "faith,"

she is perfectly consistent with her "*faith*"; but not with her 'creed,' if she have one, which we must hope she has; knowing our inconsistency.

The "faith" which is synonymous with '*persuasion*' is most powerfully sketched and fully, at Coloss. ii. 16–23, and all is summed up thus;—"Why, as living in Cosmos, are ye dogmatized—after the commandments and doctrines of the men? *Commandments* such as [ἅτινα] are [a] Logos indeed possessing of wisdom in wish-religion and humble-intentionedness and non-parsimony of body, not in value at all towards satisfying of the flesh." That is, "the flesh" may crave, and then it adopts these expedients; but they are "not in value at all" for the purpose of *real* gratification. There is no occasion for επιλησμονη for πλησμονὴ here. Observe, too, how "body" and "the flesh" are distinguished from each other. The Apostle acknowledges "logos of wisdom"; but he analyses that "logos" into its *dangerous constituents — the sensuous*, faith, which after all is not gratified. "Faith," then, or anything which can *persuade* men, of human devising is mischievous; when the Apostle says "we *persuade* men," it was "by the *terrors* of the Lord"; not by any *trumperies*, when *realities* have failed so to do. Yet Rome did affect even this with HER *thunders* and lightnings!

On the other hand, "*Belief*"—as the first in the "remaining" triplet, "*belief*, hope, charity" or *love*, is as abundantly pourtrayed in the former part of the Epistle, chap. i. ii., down to the above passage; and more particularly from ii. 6 to ver. 12. The entire suitableness of the passage to our case and argument is *marred* by the word "faith," instead of "*belief*," in its ample accordance with our Lord's own words to Thomas, John xx. 29; and indeed with John's own following thereupon, ver. 31.

There is one clause however at ii. 5 which needs notice·

Compare ver. 12, "the *belief of* the operation of the God"; whereas in ver. 5 we read, "and the stedfastness of your into-Christ belief." Note the difference, "*belief of*," ver. 12; "*belief into*" ver. 5. The former is derivative; the latter is contributive. The former is benevolence; the latter is beneficence.

But somehow, between the two prevailing words 'opinion' or 'thinking,' and "faith," which have so encroached on the pure and full force of the word I seek to restore, "*belief*" is almost crushed out of mind. One might almost instance it as proof of the severe sentence of Prof. Max Müller—that a '*thing perfect is past.*' This very instance suggests that there must be some lurking fallacy here; as, for instance, we, or our attention, *pass the thing*, not the thing "is past" us.

However, unless we get hold of the word according to the form of its name, as a *pass. perf.* or *aor. participial* or *verbal* idea, we do not get its exact meaning. The prefix *be-* shews this, as in *be-love, be-friend, be-fall, be-late, &c.* The Dutch, *geloof*, shews the same; and therefore perhaps the German *glaùbe* is for *gelaùbe*. It is not easy to say what these root-words—*lieve*,—*looven*,—*laúben*, *-lief*, *-loof*, *-laube*, would exactly mean; perhaps the *summit* idea of all may be found in *laud*, to *be-laud*; for both in Dutch and German there is the idea of *leaf*-age, *foliage, verdure*, &c., as if to *crown, adorn*, 'with bays,' &c. But these again are beyond the mark; the words are probably 'past' participles.

Although "*belief*" be now the form of the word, *lief* will not be the form of the radical, if only because it seems referable to the Lat. *libet*, which is also written *lubet*, and which Webster refers to the Saxon *leof*, loved. Yet this can show how singularly this suffix *digamma*, for such it seems, can

shift its meaning, the vowels being given quantities in their variety. Webster says '*lieve* for *lief* is vulgar'; I can answer for its being *provincial;* but what if it be more *correct?* There can hardly be a doubt that as *lieve,* in *relieve, believe,* &c., it is the Fr. *lever,* the Ital. re-*lievo,* that is to ex-*tol, lift* out, or up; so probably our almost old words *luft, lift, loft,* are all oblique forms of the same common radical. When we think of alto-*relievo* and basso-*relievo,* we seem to have in either the idea of *giving re-lief;* but suppose we say *giving lief,* instead.

Something like this, too, explains the Lat. *credo,* a *verb;* which, having no corresponding *noun,* is therefore perhaps driven to adopt *fides.* But this is a complete *jump over* the distinction which I am persuaded St. Paul aims to display.

The verb apparently means to *give cre;* and the French synonymes, *croise, crois, crayant,* seem to be to *have cre;* but what is *cre?* No doubt it is the root of *cerno, crevi, cretum,* which is 'kindred with κρίνω, from the stem, *cer.*' So that besides *separating,* as the sense, we may compare the Eng. *cleave* and *clever;* see Webster. And from all these we get the idea of *distinguish, distinct.* The German *lauf, laufen,* = κινεσις, is a step beyond this, though *but a step,* and beyond the word *cre*-ate, also. No doubt the word is seen in se-*cre*-te, ex-*cre*-te; but this too is *cer, past* in tense. If further than this we go to *cr,* κρ, we may get on to קרה, קרו, not unsatisfactorily; but, except in the commutability of the liquids *l* and *r,* we are far from our word be-*lieve.* But we may also notice that *cre* must, so far as *cerno* can show, be itself a past form of *cer,* even without the full *crev*-i, *cret*-um; and that the other etymon, *-do,* forms thus with it a kind of 'middle-voice,' or 'aorist' power. Thus when we believe a thing, it is not the *thing,* but *ourselves* in

relation to it, which are modified thereby. On the other hand, "*faith*" in or to a person or a thing (?) gives so far '*glory*' to either, which is also *our pleasure*.

Whether or not this search about the word *belief, believe*, aid us at all, I cannot doubt that πίστις, πιστευω, are the synonymes of those words, and πεῖσις of "*faith*," as *fidelity*. And by how much we stimulate "faith," so as to afford us pleasure, or even persuasion, for which we are so ready, and thus run the risk of "satiating the flesh," by so much do we forestall "*belief*," which alone can attach to the very initiative of "the Truth." Coloss. ii. 9, 10.

On one very affecting occasion our Lord once addressed these words to his disciples, Ἄρτι πιστευετε — "*Do ye now believe?*" E. V. John xvi. 31. Who could think of exchanging the word "*believe*" for "do ye now" faith? Yet these should be exactly equivalent expressions according to common usage. However, then, the Latin Vulgate renders this word *belief, believe*, by both *fides* and *credo*, the English Version ought not so to do if it would gain the precise meaning of St. Paul's fundamental idea in πίστις, "*belief*."

Such a question from our Lord to his disciples, which we last quoted, must have been most affecting, though they could not fathom the occasion as *the crisis*, as we now can after the event. The previous context shews a vehement enthusiasm pervading them; they pass on from "we can tell, *Item*, Thou canst tell all things, —— in this we believe, *Item*, from God Thou camest out." Then follows this searching question, and a prediction, the fulfilment of which falsified their professed "*belief*"; otherwise, He leaves the question to be answered by each for him, or her, self.

It was not *fidelity*, "faith," which they so professed, but "*belief*" *of a* declaration that was wholly independent of their "faith" or fidelity. So far as that questioning of their "belief" which (professing to embrace what it did) should

have been all-commanding, could have light thrown upon it beforehand, our Lord's prediction of what their *factual* answer would be, did throw it; they little imagined how their *actual* answer would verify the prediction, and belie their professed "belief." The prediction, indeed, resolves itself into a prediction of their by-and-by *infidelity, unfaith;* but these in their turn reflect the questionableness of their "*belief*" when they professed it; and, by consequence, their *untruth;* which is the ground meaning of the Hebrew equivalent, אֱמוּן, "*belief*" literally, a *prop* or *support.*

Mark the case. With *the Prop* of the world, of themselves, before their eyes, their "belief" in Him as such is questioned. Is the reason suitable here too, "*because he was not yet gloried*"? How wonderful that for many centuries there should have arisen, and '*successioned*' from "the Apostles" too, *men* officially claiming to command the "*belief*" of men like themselves! *Mysterious,* too, that men, being men, could yield to such claim!

The proposition made in a learned and important "Treatise," that between "unbounded licence of belief and practice" on the one hand, and "a system, the evils of which are as clear as the noon-day sun" on the other — to which, nevertheless, the Author has betaken himself (according to report) — or, again, that "Rationalism and Anarchy on the one hand, and Superstition on the other" — that, between these, there is no satisfactory halting-place for any man, save in the bosom of an organised 'Mother Church' as a final and satisfactory Authority, is surely untenable, satisfactorily to Revelation, Conscience, and Experience. For, to say the least, such a proposition ignores St. Paul's plain declaration, based on his own observation, that "the Gentiles are to themselves Law," and by its working "indicates the operation of *the Law.*" But what such a proposition desiderates is that very *repose,* through *fidelity* or

"*faith*," to such sensuous objects, which Revelation tries to hinder us from conjuring up. St. Paul roundly proclaims, "For *He* is our Peace"; not 'Mother Church.' And again, "for we walk through, or *by*, *belief*, not through, or *by*, the *sensuous* (εἶδος)." And again, from Habakkuk, "for he who is justi-ed out of *belief* shall, or *will*, be lifed."

The lawful authority is that which *constitutes* and *is* — the Realm, and, expressly, this "is ordinated under God." It is downright impudence to suppose that the "Him" is a '*She*,' "by whom Kings reign and Princes decree justice." When such able men as the author of this "Treatise on the Church" betake themselves to 'Rome' in England, as authority in England, such must surely have flinched from and evaded the pressure of the ordeal at "*the strait*," or the hinge, when our "faces should be set like a flint," and the assaults of "the adversary" would have been abortive for damage to us; we having "lost ourselves" in the Q. *non* E. D.

But Samson's riddle may yet have a very surprising and extensive solution even in the very heart of Rome; none more likely, under God, to prove the Instruments of it than these very men. Their very '*Apologiai*' show a candour which is not yet benighted. Nor would it surprise me to see, even in my short time, that *natural*, beautiful, luxuriant though rampant *Ireland*, proves to be very "droppings of the honey comb" which the Psalmist descried. The true patriotic feeling, which St. Paul exhibits in Rom. ix. 1–5, and xi. 1–5, can never become quite extinct; for although "*Faith*" may declaim about '*creatio ex nihilo*,' "*Belief*" never *can*. But we cannot know the force of it until we be *expatriated*. It is this feeling, *in principle*, which gives "Baptism" the least validity. And is it to be tampered with, with impunity?

I was going to insert this last Exercise where it would have been more in keeping; but since it only shaped itself finally in my mind after all, it is *less pre*tentious to leave my former stepping-stones, and let this stand alone.

We may plausibly press the matter still closer. For, since we have not a πίς in our Lexicons answering to τις, but the latter, as τίς, becomes its 'relative' or 'interrogative,' there can hardly be a doubt that τίω, τίσω is the corresponding verb to τίς, and τίνω to τις. The well-distinguished meanings of these two verbs, as they are given by Liddell and Scott, correspond herewith. There is a difficulty, however, inasmuch as the oblique *forms* of both appear as if identical; yet to make them so *in meaning* there must have been assumption. This is quite obviated if we allow that the LXX. and thence the N. T. writers, did, as it were, revive πίω, πίσω = τίω; the simple verb, of which πίπισκω is a reduplication. Thus we have under τίω the imp. act. and pass. τίεσκον; *the* form to which the Lexicons restrict τίς. It seems that the Greeks did so; and, accordingly, the noun τίσις, *q. d.* τιθις or τίστις, not τίνσις, has the sense, by usage, of τίνυμαι, τίνομαι. Hence too perhaps πίνω, πίομαι, πιοῦμαι, which should have answered to τις, τιν-, is confused with the oblique forms of τίνω, so as to be identical, in τίσις.

The only and sufficient way of clearing this is by reviving πίς, after the analogy of the obsolete πός, πόσος, as from their root πο, with which πι exactly corresponds. Their value we may gather by comparing ὁ with ὃ or ὃ-ς; and ἰ or ἱ with ἳς or ἱς; where it must seem that the so-called '*article*' ὁ and ἰ and ἳς rather are '*demonstrative* pronouns,' as is English '*the*'; and ὃς, ἱ, ἱς are '*relative* pronouns,' having passed, as it were, their '*interrogative*' stage.

Since then the meaning of τίσις degenerated into '*Vengeance*, &c., from its 'strict' sense, ἐτισθην is with propriety

referred to τίνω. But by *more than the same* 'strict' propriety ἐπισθην should be referred to πίσω and πίω, for τίω; of which πίπισκω is reduplication.

And now as to the meaning. We read under τίω 'to *pay honour to* a person,' or, of course, '*to a subject.*' I submit that this is an *excess* of this verb's force; and that this sense is to be reserved for τι-μάω, τιμή, &c. *This,* like other words better recognized in the form -μος, means the '*fulness* of' τί- which is so claimed; that is, to *pay* honour to. That form in -μ-ος is the *perf. pass.* usually, or, at least the *middle* or *pass.* derivative, of such another verb as τίω here furnishes; and hence that τίω must be reduced to some such idea as to '*yield* honor to' another; or, if you please, *vice versâ.* But, anyhow, that while τι-μαω may imply ἐπι-γιγνωσις, for instance, τί-ω, but especially as πίω, *hardly amounts* to γιγνωσις; in other words, it just means our word — *believe, belief.*

Keeping in mind, then, what we do mean by the word *believe, belief,* I see great support for this view from another source. We ought, by these premisses, to find a πιμάω, or the like, which should correspond with τιμάω; but we shall in vain look for it; because τιμαω is already a '*perfect*' respondent to τί = πί. Yet all this would be usurpation. Whether τί = πί, or the πί = τί is just the *q. e. d.* Accordingly we find what the Latin calls a '*præt-er-plu-perfect*' of πί- in the verb πι-μπλημι *q. d.* πί-μπί-λ-ημι; as reduplication of *even the* '*perfect*' *of* πί, consummated in a verb in -μι, as in εἰμὶ. It is impossible for words to exaggerate the *hyperbole* beyond what the *Latin* [?] grammarians have already done in the *name* adopted for the 'tense.' Yet the accents so modify the Greek words, now written τιμάω (with an emphatic *long ί,* however,) and therefore a πιμάω (with a *short ί*?) that we may suspect the profound analysis to have been unperceived by the Grammarians, however the Logicians saw it, but

awaiting a Paul for its unravelment. For whereas "*faith*" may equal a τίτλῆμι, τλαω, yet "*belief*," πίϛις, is the very ὑποϛασις of πιμπλημι, because it is the *aorist* of its parent πίω, and "*active* [?] *aorist*" withal.

It will suffice to simply allude to the analogous form πίμπρημι, *q. d.* πι-μπι-ρ-ημι, formed of the other semi-vowel (?) or 'liquid'; and St. Paul's description of our condition as "*sold* under sin." Perhaps the true linguistic values of these semi-vowels (in Sanscrit) or liquids, in comparison with the Hebrew ל and ר, may be discovered in this conjunction of simples. Compare the '*New Cratylus.*' Here the one or the other, respectively, is substituted for the μ of the true duplication, which *perhaps* mean more than a merely euphonic change.

I hope the particulars here in respect of our pursuit are so exhibited that the Learned can shape them to full congruity; for I have no doubt about their main correctness. A clue is furnished, with which it accurately corresponds, by the parabolic illustration of our Lord with the Samaritan woman; John iv. 10–14. Compare Mal. i. 6; this last passage is quite an explanatory study to the above purpose —(in the *Heb.* particularly); for instance, — "*Where is* that ב + ר *of mine?*" — the very literals π + τ-! — in fact, the *sum total* premised!

Section 19.

In the endeavour to collect summarily the Apostle Paul's main doctrine, and exposition of Doctrine, I had scheduled, as it were, the following texts, and in this order: Mark iv. 10, 11, Acts xxii. 16, 1 Tim. iii. 15, 16, Heb. x. 19–26, Phil ii. 5–11. But I now content myself with what must certainly be deemed a *Summary;* and one in his own words, as given by St. Luke, on a parting, 'farewell," and most

affecting occasion, at Acts xx. 17 – 38. Out of this great passage I select ver. 20, 21, for my purpose.

It will be especially noticed from ver. 17 who are the parties — "having sent into Ephesus he was thus mediately himself inviting [μετεκάλ-] the elders of the Church." There is what is very striking in this very precise mode of expression by this *midd.* voice of the *compound* verb. THUS *invited* (John ii. 2), or "*bidden*," 1 Cor. x. 27, or "*called*," 1 Cor. i. 26, and μετα, *mediately*, not by the Apostle *in person*; whether *all* "the elders" came is but to be inferred, forasmuch as no mention is made of any absent ones. But they were "the '*Elders*,' or 'Presbyters,' of the Church"; so that *the heads* of the 'summary' are, we may be sure, exact, full. No doubt the "house to house" phrase of ver. 20, (as at 1 Cor. repeatedly,) includes "the Church" at large, as well as these "Elders" now addressed; and so we have the *private* as well as "public" teaching.

There are two words used which are pregnant. The verb "*kept back*" of E. V. is well rendered; but it has here, connected with οὐδεν, the idea of *shrivelling*; just as at Heb. x. 38, "*draw back*" of E. V. it has in respect of a *person* the idea of *shrinking*. Whether or not they differ in the latter case, the verb being 'intransitive' as well as in '*midd. voice*,' but in our passage 'transitive,' by reason of οὐδεν, though also in '*midd. voice*,' may be questioned. The other word is διαμαρτ-, which occurs no less than three times in this same address. Compare διηγ- at Heb. xi. 32. The E. V. "*testifying*," is much too weak; it should be "*broadly-testifying*," or *distributively*, or *distinctly*, testifying, in every instance in this passage; the *distinctly* meaning, not '*plainly*,' which is implied in the "testifying," but *as to particulars, definitions, distinctions, items* of evidence.

The passage, then, is thus: "Serving [or δούλευων, *slaving*] to [or *by*] the Lord, — as nothing I beshrivelled [or

suppressed?] of the comfortings [*co-purportings?*] of [or *from*] the scarcely-having-announced to you and taught you, publicly and at home, [or "from house to house"?] *broadly*-testifying to Jews as well as also [τε καὶ] to Greeks, the-into-God 'WONDER' [*awe, 'repentance,'* E. V.] and belief ["*faith,*" E. V.] into our Lord Jesus Christ." The *Cod. Sinait.* has neither τὸν nor τὴν, and it has the word χριστόν.

Compare Malachi i. vi., already cited above. The first of these may be collated fully with this passage: "a son honoureth [or *glorieth*] a father, and a 'servant' [δοῦλος, LXX., *a "slave"*] his Lord [Heb. אדניו]; and if a Father, I, where my honour [*glory*?] and if Lords [אדונים], I, where my reverence," [or '*high-esteem,*' Fürst]? But then, of course, the argument held at Heb. xi. 6 is already fully accredited as true; and then the great word there, μισθαποδότης γίνεται, "that he becomes a requiter," or *giver back of hire, wages,* is an advance upon ἐστὶ, "that He is" *in being,* or "that there is" *in being, a God;* and thus is embraced the second of those two great 'collects' of the Apostle.

For, further, since the Apostle speaks of διαμαρτ., "*broadly-*, or *distributively*-testifying," by these two distinctive *Items,* this passage of Malachi reminds us of our Lord's words, as recorded at Matt. vi. 24, "No *one* can," &c. Luke xvi. 13, "No domestic, or *no one, being a domestic,* can," &c. And again Matt. xxiii. 8–10. For Malachi (not LXX.) changes the *singular* number "his Lord" [Luke xx. 44], into the *plural,* "if Lords, I." This may well be studied along with the great study which Jesus gave to, and left for, the Jews; Luke xx. 41.

These, then, are the sole *items* which the Apostle Paul left as a '*Creed,*' or *Symbolum!* Not a hint at "circumcision," either *pro* or *con,* nor even at "Baptism," &c., &c.

Why, then, write so many Epistles? Because the whole Field is pre-occupied, pre-engaged. Collate, further, the *reasoning* of the first two or three chapters of 1 Cor. And perhaps this Enquiry may well close here in these pages with Tertullian's words, '*Ratio Dei, res est,*' thus rendered by some one, '*Fact is God's argument.*' I say 'perhaps.' But I am responsible for introducing Tertullian. '*Perhaps*' rather, if we understood his meaning by the Latin words, we should concur with him. But, as for the translation, all that we can say is that it is *figurative*. I would rather render it, '*The ratio of God is a fact.*'

But, having started what may possibly reflect on 'the powers that be,' I would supply out of St. Paul's words an ἐπερωτημα, or "*answer.*"

I have said a good deal about "*belief*"; and beyond question the phrase here "*belief into*" is *exhaustive of the believer*, if we realize the force of the word "LORD" *as our belonging*; 1 Cor. xii. 3. But what I argue is that, if only forasmuch as the state of "TRIAL" remains, *this* does not *secure*, though it be *promissory of*, πεῖσις, "*faith,*" or *fidelity*, which is jumped at, "*robbed,*" in general. This, then I leave for εἰδησις, σὺνειδησις, *the sensuous.* Not because I think it is very separable in act, however it be in fact, from what now here follows; but for the sake of '*analysis,*' rather than of "*analogy.*"

But this other *item* — E. V. "*repentance*"! The more technical we make it, so much the more I firmly, *dreadfully, believe*, that we disparage, not only the 'creature,' but its Creator!

As above we have "*belief into,*" so here we have "'*repentance*' *into.*" If, "though I have all *belief*, and could move mountains, I *yet* am nothing," what shall we expect from '*change of mind,*' "repentance"? It is only as "*usurpation,*" ἁρπαγμος, that we can *push in there* the word "*faith,*"

for *belief;* I would gladly exercise such *usurping* power over Humanity as to *push in* a substitute for the word "*repentance*" in the parallelism. *Oceans* of tears will not alter the "*willedment*" of God, any more than the prophecies of Isaac and Jacob, surely! This *dissolving* principle, λυπη, "*sorrow*," *grief, follows on upon, springs out of,* this "repentance"; '*remorse,*' μεταμελεία, will lead to *bucket-fuls* of tears, but it will not lead to "*repentance.*"

'*Ratio,*' '*reason,*' — do Tertullian and we mean the same thing? — pretends to the *compass* of the said Rational; it is no 'argument," it is, in its virgin simplicity, '*a fact,*" '*res.*' But "*repentance,*" or rather this word μετανοία, *goes* '*right into the middle*' *of things.* So long as we bother *about the outskirts* we are bewildered, and make the Middle perhaps ten times bigger than it is. *We* — *we* bother? *We* do not bother; it is, again, only the *outsides of us* which bother. And so, what with *outsides* and *outskirts* we may get up — what shall we say? — a *skirmish?* 'That 's no fair *fight!*' 'That 's *no go!*' 'That 's of *no good.*'

I conceive that however we understand the word '*Reason,*' *ratio,* we do wrong to disparage it, as if on the presumption that we have ascertained and measured it. How else should we understand "with all thine heart, with all thy mind, with all thy strength," &c.? This is meant to comprise the '*ratio*' of man as '*res,*' 'a fact.' The 'argument' deducible, less from *things that be* than from *me that am,* is, as so drawn by "Him who knew what is in man," rather, that my whole *ratio* "WILLS not to" — not '*can* not to,' for that seems too plain to be doubted, but — "WILLS not to." So "the Saviour" interprets man and his case; "WILLS not to" — say, focalize his *mind,* or, rather, νοία his *thinking effort,* his *attention,* upon the MEANING of Things with the *might and* MAIN which he has. This "to WILL," τὸ θελειν, is *an original,* Rom. vii. 18; as we above examined the passage. In how much it

belongs to me as such is not quite easy to infer from παράκειται, E. V. "*is present*," '*is lying alongside of me*,' or '*on the same level with me*'; but there even Paul *was baulked*. So that certainly no *outsidings* will avail "for *good*."

We are driven back, then, to Moses's reading of *children's* views of their parents' doings of outlandish things — "What mean ye by this *latria*," that is, this *stealthy* "service" or *slavery?* And at last Peter himself can write of these doings in the strong terms of i. 18 of his first Epistle — "forasmuch as ye know ['*-can tell*'], *item*, not by corruptibles, silver-wise or gold-wise, ye were ransomed out of your FATUOUS BEHAVIOUR TRADITIONAL FROM THE FATHERS, but," &c. The construction of the Greek makes the "*fatuity* YOURS," whatever the "behaviour" had in times past been *to the fathers*. Nothing but the *cores*, the *cœurs*, the *hearts*, the *middles*, the vital, fatal MEANINGS of things can answer, or — *enquire*. Gal. iii. 3.

Postscript.

While these Papers are in the Press, "the first Sunday after Easter" has passed. The portion of Scripture appointed for the Lessons seemed purposed to uphold Prelacy, and even somewhat more, at least by implication.

The first Lesson is Num. xvi.; where the Levites' "service of the tabernacle" is plainly distinguished from "the priesthood's," which, by previous appointment, attaches to Aaron and his Sons. Yet it *is* much to be observed that here, throughout, Moses was the great actor; and he was not "Priest" but the Law-giver, as well as "*King* in Jeshurun"; that is, in the administration of justiness. Like David, and others after him, Moses "sat in the gate" for the purpose, until minor judges were set under him. *Moses* then, as a "*Prince*" (? or even '*more*,' שׂרר), *defends* "the

priesthood," and calls for execution upon "Korah and all his company." He too, *as Principal,* then directs Aaron what to do to arrest "the plague," and, according to the Institution, Aaron goes to negotiate "an Atonement for the people," "and," in a miraculous manner, "the plague was stayed."

It is undoubtedly thus that the only place which can gainsay this is to be interpreted; Psalm xcix. 6; "Moses and Aaron among His priests," just as the next stave adds, "and Samuel among them that call upon His name." It does not assert Moses to be a "Priest" in the sense that Aaron was, still less that Aaron had a higher Estate than Moses; but rather that Moses was Priest, as were Jethro, Melchisedeck, and all 'Heads of *houses*,' or '*wicks*.'

All this is in true keeping, for it was the province of *Privilege*. Thus Moses expostulates,—"and what is Aaron?" as if to find fault with *him?* As afterwards, "Who is Paul? or who is Apollos?" that ye should so extol *them?* The explanation is that that '*Privilege*' in the forms then extant has now been consummated; and we now are all thrown 'on our beam-ends'; or, as a great Naturalist and Divine said, 'every tub must stand on its own bottom' *now*.

Then comes 'the Second Lesson,' Acts xvi., still keeping up the idea of Prelacy; for even then the *Christian* 'Sanhedrim' is still in the ascendant. Thus Paul "circumcises Timothy"; but it is most expressly said that he did so "along of the Jews in those places" where they were gospelling. Grant too, what is unlikely, that Paul and Silas travelled *alone;* and that *these two* are the "they" of ver. 4. We then still have Paul quite disposed to give all honour and deference to the decisions of that same Christian Sanhedrim. Yet there is still a peculiarity in the language: "They gave over to them to guard the dogmas forasmuch as they were adjudged *such* under the Apostles and the

Elders they being in Jerusalem." N.B. This is literal; and the *participial* force must not be evaded.

And thus probably "they" continued so to do as they go forward to Philippi. Here again Paul must have been at least assenting to the "baptism" of Lydia, even *after* that most conclusive evidence of ver. 14. I know that there are some who would argue the necessity of that canonical "baptism" in this case of Lydia, and thence of course for that of all. Yet why jump to the conclusion that Paul either directly or indirectly "baptized" her *with water?* If he "baptized" her *into tears,* "whose heart the Lord opened," it had been more in accordance with his seeking. Certainly, however, had he in any still usual way "baptized" *her,* he could not fail to have remembered and recorded, in 1 Cor. i., this first recorded instance of his then so doing. We may safely conclude that *he did not.*

A verse of one of the Psalms for the day, xcvi. 10, read in the Hebrew, with its context, has great bearing on that *upset-state,* which, I urge, "Baptism" really implies. And here, without flinching, I would interpose the Gospel for the day, John xx. 19, *et seq.,* which no doubt *seems* in keeping with the rest of the service. But ver. 24 quite proves that "the disciples," from ver. 19 to ver. 23, do not mean "the twelve" only. And concede what you will to ver. 23, including even all that is claimed for 'the Confessional,' but *not* limiting it to "the twelve,' and therefore not to 'Apostolical Succession' as imperiously authoritative,— *take* the supposed power who ever will, he must also bide the consequences; "for with what measure ye mete it will, or *shall,* be measured to you again." Will you officially dare, being rational?

But why 'peculiarly' affect the power? Paul, we know, uncanonical as he was by 'ecclesiastical authority' any more than Philip and others, could, and did, circumstances

demanding according to his judgment, strike Elymas blind. Can you do so? If then the power of working real miracles "in the open" have ceased, why pretend to it "in secret"? Can you even tell me my "most easily besetting sin," or any other sin, before I "confess" them to you? If not, how can you 'absolve' me?

'The Second Lesson' however closes with *a miracle* which must be astounding to the miracle-mongers on the Continent now. Here we have a most handy "damsel, possessed with a spirit of divination," bringing in lots of money to her keepers; and not only so, but by the same extraordinary "spirit," and doubtless with her usual force and influence upon the masses, actually extolling "these men," Paul and Silas, as "the servants of the Most High God." What would not some Romish Priests on the Continent give now for such "a damsel"?

But what does Paul do? *Exorcise her!* Relinquishing spurious gain; foregoing a cheating opportunity; — for he has nothing to do with her abusers' losses hereby; — because the burden of his gospelling evidently is that — 'every tub must stand on its own bottom,' which shall be profound, honest and intelligent "*belief*," not a superficial and superstitious *credulity*. Psalm xviii. 44, 45.

00111513

D. MARPLES, PRINTER, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018